

Appendix A

**Response to Comments on June 2010
Draft of BRAC 133 TMP**

GENERAL COMMENTS

General Comments:

1. What environmental study has been done on the impact of the exhaust fumes from shuttle buses and additional traffic on the roadways from the King St. Metro station? Pg. 52

An environmental assessment in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) was conducted prior to selection of the Mark Center site.

2. To what extent have the potential (traffic) ramifications of things such as the Beauregard Corridor Plan and the redevelopment of Landmark Mall and the Plaza at Landmark been considered?

The BRAC-133 TMP focuses on traffic impacts expected from the Mark Center only.

Comments related to the Shuttle:

There were a number of comments related the shuttle plan. The shuttle plan details were not included in the draft TMP as they were not final at that time. As a result of these comments, the TMP has been amended to include information and/or clarification on the points discussed below.

3. What is the anticipated number of shuttle buses that will be leaving the King Street Metro Station in the morning and the number returning in the afternoon?

There are currently 6 buses planned per hour, for a total of 18 buses in the morning peak period and 18 buses in the afternoon peak period.

4. When will plans be final for the WHS DoD BRAC-133 shuttle program? Pg. 39

The following key details of the shuttle plan have now been finalized and are included in the TMP:

- Final routes (including a Franconia/Springfield Route) and preliminary routing
- System capacity
- Headways, or frequency of service from each pick-up location

5. Will shuttles run on Saturdays and Sundays? If not what is the projection for SOV traffic using network roadways serving BRAC-133? Pg. 40

No, there will be no service on weekends because tenants will not routinely operate for regular business on those days (except for security personnel). We do not anticipate significant numbers of weekend employees, thus we presume minimal SOV travel impacts to Mark Center during the weekend.

6. What criteria (data) will WHS use when analyzing shuttle rider ship trends? What amount of change will be required to warrant a change? Ten, fifty, one hundred plus or minus riders? Pg. 40

WHS will be looking at both ridership and survey results over time to determine needs. The minimum level of service for each route is 8 to 10 passengers per revenue hour during peak times. If a route services less than 8 to 10 passengers per revenue hour, the team (WHS/DFD) will need to examine the route and determine the correct strategy to improve the route's passengers per revenue hour. This may include increasing educational programs, making schedule adjustments, or altering the level of service.

If a route's level of service increases over LOS E/F or 150% of seating capacity, the team (WHS/DFD) will need to develop service improvements to the route. These may include additional revenue hours, larger vehicles, educational programs, coordination of services, or additional coordination.

In addition, the team (WHS/DFD) will use information from the annual surveys and analyses based on the levels of service and service quality standards from the TCRP report 100.

7. Are the shuttle frequencies a result of capacity/convenience/financial practicality or are they based solely upon projected demand?

The shuttle plan is being developed based on anticipated demand including a growth factor in case demand exceeds projections. In the TMP shuttle ridership is anticipated to be 23 percent whereas the shuttle plan is being developed to handle a capacity of 45 percent.

8. What do the shuttles do during off-peak hours? Does the extent of their off-peak utility impact the extent of the available shuttles at peak hours (i.e. limit the number of vehicles WHS would be prepared to purchase)?

The shuttle plan includes mid-day (off-peak) service. During other off-peak hours (e.g., weekends), the buses will either be parked or they will be used for other purposes. The off-peak utility of the vehicles will have no impact on the extent of the peak hour service to be provided.

9. Have the costs of the shuttle service(s) been calculated? Is there a point at which this would constrain WHS' ability to offer all the services desired/required?

Yes, costs for shuttle services have been calculated. Funding has been identified and approved for the services necessary to provide sufficient shuttle capacity to serve the building population.

10. Is there a point at which Alexandria will or could be expected to shoulder some of the costs?

No, the City of Alexandria is not expected to cover any of the costs for providing the DoD shuttle service.

11. To what extent has maximizing/optimizing the use of the existing DASH bus system been considered?
12. To what degree might economies of scale be realized by expanding the existing DASH bus system rather than establishing numerous new routes (and adding numerous new busses?) to the DOD shuttle system?

To answer both questions #11 and #12: DoD is evaluating the potential for local and regional service providers to provide part or all of the DoD Mark Center shuttle service. Decisions will be based on efficiency and cost effectiveness. DoD has not yet committed to any specific service providers. WHS will continue discussions with DASH and WMATA concerning possible route enhancements. Decisions will be made based on whether efficiency and effectiveness gains can be achieved.

13. Page 37: Would the proposed five bus bays be sufficient to handle all the local Mark Center express shuttle and DoD shuttles during the peak conditions? How many shuttles or buses will be needed considering the anticipated ridership? Have detail plans and the funding sources been identified for running the shuttle operations? Are adequate bus bays available at the transit hubs and Metro stations for the DoD shuttle service?

The capacity of the bus bays are sufficient as according to the requirements of TCRP Report 100: Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual. The current five bus bays also have excess capacity to support additional service. As discussed in Section 5.5.4, expanding the Transportation Center is something that will be considered in the future if needed. The final shuttle plan included in the TMP provides capacity for 45 percent of the employee population. As discussed in the response to comment #7, costs for shuttle services have been calculated and funding has been identified and approved for the services necessary to provide capacity for 45 percent of the building population. Certain Metro stations currently have limited bus bay capacity to accommodate the DoD shuttle service; however, WHS is working with WMATA and local jurisdictions to identify plausible bus queuing areas.

14. Is there the potential to, at some point, consolidate what will now be four different shuttle providers (Duke, CNA, IDA, WHS), which would presumably result in a variety of efficiencies?

15. At some point economies of scale could doubtless be realized by including IDA, CNA, Duke and possibly others in the program.

To answer both questions #13 and #14: Yes, WHS has engaged in preliminary discussions with other shuttle-providing entities at Mark Center about consolidating service. This could be a possibility in the future; however, parties have not come to agreements at this time.

16. Is there a possibility that those driving cars will pick commuters up at Metro locations thus diminishing the number of shuttle riders? Pg. 11

Yes, it is possible that drivers will pick up commuters at Metrorail stations; however, it is inconvenient to do so and therefore unlikely to occur.

17. Is there the possibility that shuttle buses will pick employees up at locations other than Metro stations?

No, this is not a possibility. Shuttle buses will only pick up and drop off employees at designated Metrorail station locations.

18. Has DoD coordinated these proposed pick-ups with the Washington Metro?

Yes, WHS is working with WMATA and local jurisdictions to identify plausible bus queuing areas in and around WMATA Metrorail stations.

19. What will happen if the travel lanes on Seminary Rd. east of 395 do not handle the east bound traffic (shuttle buses headed to the King St. Metro)? There is a right turn only lane and a left turn only lane at Seminary and N. Howard St. That leaves only one through lane. The right-turn only lane must remain for emergency vehicles turning to the INOVA Hospital.

The shuttle plan will add just six buses per hour to the existing traffic heading to/from the King Street Metrorail station. This addition is not significant given existing traffic patterns.

20. The plan and analysis totally ignores the Franconia-Springfield Railway Express station and availability of parking for employees travelling along the I-395 corridor. This option should be considered, just as options for shuttle service from the Pentagon Transit Center, King Street Metro

Station, Ballston, East Falls and West Falls Church Metrorail Stations, Metro and VRE stations were considered in the TMP.

21. There are 5,069 parking spaces at the Springfield-Franconia Metro/VRE station. This is a potential site for shuttling employees using the I-395 corridor.
22. Given the noted density of personnel along the I-95/I-395 corridor (also see page 11 for reference to this), why would one not consider shuttle service from the Franconia/Springfield station which is not only served by VRE and Metrorail but where there are 5,069 park and ride spaces (occupancy rate not provided - see page 43)?
23. With the highest density of employees going to the MARC Center site living in Fairfax County (south), the plan should include maximizing the potential utilization of the Franconia Springfield Transportation Center.
24. There were some good things that Alexandria mentioned including the comments on mode splits, transit, and vanpools but just before vanpools Alexandria has a comment about providing shuttle service to Franconia Springfield. This really concerns me and my neighbors as first there is currently no where to park, these people going to Brac will take up spaces that we use to ride the metro, and driving from that station to the Brac location on 395 takes a long time due to traffic. So my question is will Alexandria pay to add parking spaces to the metro station. I would think that someone in Alexandria has common sense to know that running shuttles on 395 in traffic is a stupid idea especially since they cannot run from the metro station to the Brac facility by HOV so does Alexandria plan to run those shuttles through our neighborhood? Traffic is already bad in the morning and afternoon along S. Van Dorn and adding those shuttles would just increase traffic. I thought the goal was to decrease traffic and all Alexandria is doing is putting the burden on those that live down here if that is the plan. Also those shuttles would get stuck in traffic on van dorn.

Comments #20-#24 are related to operating DoD shuttles to/from the Franconia-Springfield Metrorail station. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed in comments #18-#22:

- The shuttle plan details were not included in the draft TMP due to City and Fairfax County staff requests to discuss the feasibility of service to Van Dorn and Franconia-Springfield Metro Stations.
 - The shuttle plan is included in the TMP with details on:
 - Final routes (including a Franconia/Springfield Route) and preliminary routing
 - System capacity
 - Headways, or frequency of service from each pick-up location
 - It is not expected that there will be a drastic increase in the number of commuters driving to the Franconia-Springfield Metrorail station in order to board the DoD shuttle as 17 percent of employees currently board Metrorail at this station. DoD is committed to providing appropriate shuttle service from sites such as Franconia-Springfield Metrorail station as the organization believes that convenient shuttle service is essential to reducing SOV trips not just locally, but regionally.
25. Has consideration (especially by Washington Metro) been given to the probability of WHS personnel driving to a Metro Stop and parking there and catching a DoD Shuttle so that they don't have to fight the traffic and hassle of parking at the Mark Center? These persons would take parking capacity away from the Metro and deprive the Metro of revenue from people riding the Metro.

Not all of the Metro Stations under consideration for DoD shuttles have parking. For those that do, yes, some BRAC 133 employees may choose to park at a Metro Station and take the DoD shuttle to the building as their primary mode. Certainly commuters in general do park at Metro Stations when using other modes and WMATA is aware of this. WHS coordinated with WMATA in selecting shuttle routes.

26. How many of the potential '69 buses including public transit vehicles and DoD shuttles during both the AM and PM peak hours that could serve the Mark Center Transportation Center will be coming from the King St. Metro station? Pg. 49

This statement refers to a finding of a previous study which is not relevant to the TMP now that there is more accurate data on the number of expected DoD shuttles serving the site. As discussed in Section 3.5.2, the number of anticipated DoD shuttles serving the site from King Street is 18 (6 per hour) during the three AM peak hours and 18 (6 per hour) during the three PM peak hours.

27. Where will the VRE riders exit the train? Will this require additional shuttle buses? Pg. 14, Pg. 17

VRE riders are expected to disembark at King Street or Springfield Franconia stations. The shuttle bus plan includes capacity for these riders.

28. DoD shuttle buses for employees are proposed to be operating at 10 or 15 minute headways to and from Metro Stations during the AM/PM peak periods. The TMP should consider impacts on traffic near and in the metro station bus terminal area to ensure the shuttle buses are not adding to congestion and that employees can reasonably expect on time service.

The addition of the small number of buses at each station (6 per hour) is not anticipated to significantly increase congestion at those locations.

29. The traffic and roadway recommendations should be re-examined in the context of transit operations in the vicinity. The site will receive numerous buses and shuttles throughout the day, improvements that reduce or eliminate delays and do not preclude proposed bus routings would help maintain a desired level of service for transit operations. The final TMP should identify new shuttle bus routings in the vicinity of BRAC 133 and incorporate proposed bus routing changes that have been approved by DASH, WMATA and the City of Alexandria. Also, any new traffic signals should be able to accommodate future transit signal priority.

The final TMP identifies a proposed shuttle bus plan that has been coordinated with the City of Alexandria. USACE/WHS will continue to meet with the City, Fairfax County, and service providers to develop bus route changes that will benefit both the BRAC-133 project and the City.

30. Have there been any discussions (and agreements) with the activities who would be buying these buses?

USACE and WHS are engaged in ongoing discussions with the City of Alexandria, and transit providers regarding shuttle services, including source of buses, financing and operations. Buses may be leased, not purchased, and are expected to be available to support the opening of the building. The DoD shuttle system will likely operate separately from local bus systems.

31. To distribute the shuttle trips from the King St. Metro station equitably I propose that shuttles be coded indicating which ones will use King St. to N. Beauregard to BRAC-133, Braddock Rd. to N.

Beauregard to BRAC-133 and Seminary Rd. to N. Beauregard to BRAC-133. This would spread the traffic over three possible routes to help diminish the impact on only one route. Pg. 64

USACE, WHS, and the City will be examining all shuttle bus routes beginning in September to validate the most efficient structure to move BRAC 133 employees from King Street Metro to the Mark Center.

32. Presumably many SOVs will pick up riders from local Metro stations in order to qualify for an HOV parking space, while reducing the need for shuttle service.

We do not foresee this happening as registered members of a carpool will not qualify for mass transit benefits. Riders from Metro stations are more likely to rely on the DoD shuttle system than forego this benefit.

Comments related to Satellite Parking:

33. I also agree with Dave Cavanaugh that DoD shuttle service from satellite parking areas should also serve as an interim alternative. Could Landmark Mall as currently occupied, be an option for SOV parking? If so, a clear route from northbound I-395 into the Mall parking will need to be designated to go to the Van Dorn entrance. Vehicles presently get off the northbound interstate exit and cut into the dedicated left lane ramp entrance which is unsafe and not allowed.

34. Fails to consider DoD shuttle service from satellite parking areas as an interim alternative.

35. The TMP should be phased-in, with a percentage of employees parking at satellite parking facilities and brought to the WHS-BRAC-133 Complex by public transit or shuttle. This would require the DoD to rent space at vacant commercial sites for temporary parking until transit, road improvements, employees enrolled and elements of the Transportation Management Plan are fully implemented. Full use of the parking facilities at the WHS-BRAC should begin once objectives of the TMP and transit goals are met.

Comments #33-#35 are related to operating DoD shuttles to/from satellite parking areas. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed:

- The DoD is committed to the parking cap that has been established for this site and has no plans to provide remote parking as an interim solution.
- The TMP will not be phased-in, but will be fully implemented upon the opening of the facility.

36. To what extent have shuttles from park and ride lots been explored?

WHS is coordinating with both public and private transit providers to establish service between park and ride lots and BRAC 133. At this time, DoD has no plans to provide DoD shuttle service to and from park and ride lots (other than those associated with Metrorail and/or VRE stations).

Comments related to the Moran Legislation:

37. The plan does not discuss the provision in the FY 2011 House Armed Services Authorization bill that puts a temporary restriction on parking for BRAC-133 employees at 1,000 spaces. Is a contingency plan being prepared to address this limitation on parking?

38. First, with respect to Dave's comment regarding the temporary restriction to 1000 parking spaces addressed in the House version of the Defense Authorization Bill, a TMP approach addressing that possibility is essential, even if the provision is not incorporated in the final Authorization Bill. This would require TMP identification/provision of alternative transportation for an additional 2,430 no-drive and park commuters beyond the 2,970 asserted to be provided for in the Executive Summary of the current TMP draft. It must be recognized that traffic at critical intersections near the site is already bordering on failing service levels during rush hours and that much of this has occurred since earlier traffic studies cited in the draft TMP were prepared. There are no totally effective short-term solutions to these problems and it will be several years (as Dave points out) before major changes such as direct site access from 395 can be approved, funded, and completed.
39. The evaluation reports should report on the percentage of occupancy in the building if there is a phase in process, depending on the passing of the FY 2011 House Armed Services Authorization bill with Moran's parking space stipulation.

40. What is the plan if Representative Moran's "amendment" gets passed?

41. What happens if the Moran proposal goes through (which would prohibit alternative paid parking?)

Comments #37-#41 are related to the Moran Legislation. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed: The TMP does not include language or strategies to address the proposed legislation. The introduction of the TMP has been revised to acknowledge that revisions to the TMP will be required if the legislation is passed.

Comments related to Cost/Financial Information:

42. Will WHS be exclusively responsible for maintaining the Transportation Center? Is it anticipated that any portion of the expense will be borne by Alexandria?

Yes, WHS will be exclusively responsible for maintaining the Transportation Center. No, the City of Alexandria is not expected to cover any portion of the costs for maintaining the facility.

43. To what extent have cost ramifications been considered?

Yes, costs for shuttle services have been calculated. Funding has been programmed for the services necessary to provide capacity for 45 percent of the building population

44. Is there a potential that good ideas will not be pursued purely because of the economic consequences?

DoD has not and will not rule out creative solutions purely based on cost. Decisions have been and will continue to be made based on whether efficiency and effectiveness gains can be achieved from proposed solutions.

45. Has the City of Alexandria made any assessment of the cost ramifications to the City of what is or is not contemplated in the TMP?

46. Again, as but one example, how many more DASH busses might be needed? What's the lead time? How will/would they be paid for?

Comments #45 and #46 should be directed to the City of Alexandria.

47. Plan lacks necessary details on costs and sources of funding for proposed TMP improvement. The state is not a likely source for increased funding nor is the City and this is worrisome since changes will take a lot of money.

The DoD has programmed funding to implement the TMP strategies including the DoD shuttle service. DoD has also paid for the road improvements required by the City as a condition of the development (those referred to as “interim [2011] roadway improvements” in the TMP). The “Recommended Solutions” identified in Section 4.4.9 (now called “Suggestions that Require Further Consideration / Study”) are possibilities for the future and are in response to general needs of the area, not just those related to BRAC 133. These items would require technical validation, legal authority, and identification of funding sources. It is expected that a number of these proposed improvements will be explored as part of the impending VDOT study of other potential mid- and long-term improvements, and as part of the City’s development of the West End.

48. Who pays for the ‘improvement of the existing walkways and addition of new sidewalks outside of the site? Have skywalks been considered? Pg. 27, Pg. 28

DoD is responsible for the cost of sidewalk improvements adjacent to the BRAC 133 site. See Figure 3-4 for the approved pedestrian sidewalk improvements. Skywalks have not been considered in the TMP.

49. In the traffic impact analysis section of the plan, reference is made to the ongoing VDOT study to develop alternatives for providing direct HOV access to the site from I-395. The plan should clearly indicate that it will take multiple years to fund, design, and construct such an access.

This comment has been noted. Language in the TMP has been modified to clarify this point.

50. On Page 90, Section 4.4.9 offers several roadway and intersection improvements to address impacts of the baseline and projected volumes. There is no discussion, however, of how to fund these improvements and what would happen if most or all could not be implemented.

It should be noted that the traffic analyses presented in the TMP do not rely on those recommended improvements presented in Section 4.4.9. These “Recommended Solutions” identified in Section 4.4.9 (now called “Suggestions that Require Further Consideration / Study”) are possibilities for the future and are in response to general needs of the area, not just those related to BRAC 133. These items would require technical validation, legal authority, and identification of funding sources. It is expected that a number of these proposed improvements will be explored as part of the impending VDOT study of other potential mid- and long-term improvements, and as part of the City’s development of the West End.

Comments related to the TMP Goals:

51. What is the baseline for the TMP goals of a "40% reduction in single occupancy vehicle trips?"
52. The TMP should state very clearly what the end state is that must be achieved. The Army, Duke, the City, et al heretofore have led us all to believe that the TMP was to get to a 40% non-single

occupancy mode share, which is not the same thing as a 40% reduction in SOV vehicle trips. The TMP goals need to be articulated so clearly that a 5th grader can understand them, e.g., no more than x% of total employee and visitor trips to the site will be by SOV.

53. I strenuously object to the goal as being to "encourage alternate commuter modes ...". That is a good intention, but the Road to Hell is paved with such things. The goal is to achieve (not encourage) major (or significant or substantial) diversion of commuter trips to ridesharing, transit, walking, and bicycle. And then this document is supposed to enumerate all the things which are incumbent on WHS, other parts of the Army, Duke, etc., to make sure -- absolutely and unequivocally -- that such diversion occur. And then to test to prove they are happening, and to revise and implement a stronger plan if they are not.

54. Perhaps it's only semantics but I would suggest that the TMP goal is to achieve (not "strive for") not more than "X %" of personnel using SOVs to access the site (as opposed to "a 40 per cent reduction [from what?] of SOV trips to the BRAC-133 site").

Comments #51-#54 are related to the word choice of how SOV reduction goal was stated in the TMP. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed:

- The TMP includes new language to replace the existing language. The new language has been rephrased to more clearly align with the intent of the goal.
- It now reads, "To achieve 40 percent or more non-SOV trips to the site in order to minimize traffic impacts on the neighboring community."

55. ES-1 - How were the TMP goals established?

The TMP goals were established based on GSA/MWCOG/NCPC guidelines as referenced in Section 1.3. This guidance indicates that a TMP should include stated goals for single occupant vehicle (SOV) trip reduction, transportation mode split, and vehicle occupancy; strategies to minimize SOV work trips and to discourage SOV travel during peak and off-peak hours; measures to monitor achievement of goals and to adjust SOV trip reduction strategies, as needed; and a description of existing and projected peak hour traffic by mode.

56. Is there a commonly accepted way to assess how reasonable/ aggressive they are or aren't?

No, there is no commonly accepted mechanism for assessing the aggressiveness of goals.

57. What happens if 'striving for a 40 percent reduction of SOV trips to the BRAC-133 site in order to minimize traffic impacts on the neighboring community' does not happen? What is the contingency plan?

USACE/WHS are confident in the abilities of WHS to meet the goals of the TMP given that the DoD shuttle system will provide such extensive service with capacity for 45 percent of the building population, combined with the fact that the building will have such limited parking available, and finally given that WHS will be implementing a variety of other comprehensive TDM strategies. WHS will be evaluating achievement of goals over time (and formally with each Evaluation Report), and will be setting new goals over time based on findings.

The TMP includes language demonstrating examples of how goals will be assessed and rectified if not met, (i.e., if transit ridership goals are not met, WHS will re-examine the DoD shuttle plan and make changes to increase ridership, etc.).

Comments related to Role of the BRAC Advisory Group:

58. How many ideas and recommendations from the BRAC Advisory Group has become part of the plan? Pg. 3

59. Why did the study ‘not examine or attempt to validate the concerns and/or assumptions made by citizens, nor has an effort been made to reference any studies that may validate citizen assumptions’? Pg. 92

In response to comments #58-#59: All ideas and recommendations of the BRAC Advisory Group were considered in the development of the TMP. In addition, several were integrated into the TMP. For example, many of the traffic improvements provided by the Group were validated and included in Section 4.4.9. Additionally, Franconia-Springfield Metro Station is now a shuttle pick-up/drop-off point for the DoD shuttle system, and the use of DASH to support the shuttle system is being explored.

60. The BRAC Advisory Committee needs to be provided copies of the brochures, pamphlets, posters, and other marketing media for employees as well as the Orientation Handbook. Pg. 102, Pg. 103

WHS will provide the representative materials as they become available.

61. The BRAC Advisory Committee needs to receive the results of the July 2010 resurvey of employees commuting patterns as well as the one in the winter of 2010. Pg. 104

WHS will report on the 2010 resurvey and future surveys.

62. City Staff and The BRAC Advisory Committee should approve any amendments to the TMP. Pg. 121

DoD will continue to coordinate with the City of Alexandria on changes to the TMP after the occupancy of the building, as stated throughout Sections 5 and 6 of the TMP.

63. Who is the intended "customer" of the TMP document? To what extent is it meant (essentially solely?) for WHS and to what extent is it intended or meant to inform the public? or the City? or NCPC? or who else?

According to NCPC TMP guidelines, “The purpose of a TMP is to document an employer’s active program to foster more efficient employee commuting patterns by minimizing ‘single occupant vehicle’ (SOV) trips related to a federal agency.” As such, the primary “user” of the TMP will be all of the BRAC 133 tenant organizations (or employers) housed at BRAC 133.

However, also according to NCPC TMP guidelines, “A TMP offers a set of strategies to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution,” which has impacts on the surrounding community. Therefore, the document also serves to inform not only NCPC, but the City, neighboring jurisdictions, and the general public about the strategies being employed to reduce congestion and air pollution impacts to the community in which these tenant organizations are housed.

Comments related to Parking:

64. Garage reserved spaces for govt vehicles, special fuel cars, etc. Will there be designated spaces equipped and assigned to accommodate vehicles which require electric recharging during their parking time?

No, there will not be electrical charging stations in the parking garage at this time.

65. Handicapped parking. Your 48 spaces sound ridiculously low (less than 1% of the workforce) to start with. Plus, this, in an age where a) more disabled people work/need to work, b) where people are working to a later age = more disabilities, and c) where the government will need to be providing more jobs for the Iraq-era disabled veterans and civilians. What realistic plans will you have to accommodate these factors? Then, add the people who will have temporary impairing conditions (medical, accidents, etc). The TMP seriously needs to address this situation.

48 spaces were provided per ADA requirements. As is the legal requirement for all disabled parking spaces, a disabled license plate and/or placard must be displayed to park in a disabled parking space. In the event more than 48 employees require reasonable accommodation in the form of a disabled parking space, WHS make adjustments to the parking plan as required.

66. While the parking management plan is the highlight of the TMP, the final distribution of parking spaces or parking permits among employees is determined by the tenant organization. The criteria for determining eligibility for a parking space still remain unclear. Tenant organizations are free to develop their own criteria. There is nothing in the TMP that would require these organizations to consider transit access, or lack thereof, as one of the criteria in allocating parking resources. The TMP does not suggest any parking allocation policy that would affect the geographic distribution of transit riders and thus impact the expected number of transit commuters arriving from each of the several Metrorail and bus transit access points.

The potential benefits of including transit access, or lack thereof, as one of the criteria in determining eligibility for a parking space will be explained to the tenant organizations and they will be strongly advised to consider this factor in assigning parking permits.

67. Does that then indicate that no space will typically be used for more than 8 hours per day, sitting unused for the remaining 16 hours?

68. Will the space assigned to someone working 5 (or 4) days a week then sit totally unused for the other 2 or 3 days a week?

69. One assumes peak occupancy will generally be from, say, 7 am to 6 pm Mondays through Fridays. If someone (whose vehicle is not among the chosen parking permit holders) works an appreciably different shift and/or on Saturday or Sunday are they unable to access garages which are presumably 80% or more vacant?

Comments #647-#69 are related to the one to one matching of permits to employees. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed in comments #63-#65:

- There will be 150 other federal and non-federal employees at BRAC 133 providing a range of support functions, including security, IT, building management, and other service functions. Each tenant organization is responsible for their non-federal employees, and all non-federal employees will be expected to follow the same protocol as federal employees. The TMP strategies will also apply to these employees. Each tenant organization will determine whether their contract employees will be eligible for parking permits. These employees will be able to utilize the DoD shuttle, as the system has sufficient capacity to support these employees, even in the off-peak.
- A description clarifying the aforementioned description has been added to the TMP.

70. To the extent that all parking spaces are apparently pre-allocated how can "carpool/vanpool parking...not be capped"?

Parking permits for carpool/vanpool parking spaces will take priority over SOV parking permits. In the event that demand for carpool/vanpool permits exceeds the number of spaces initially designated for carpool/vanpool, additional SOV parking spaces will be converted to carpool/vanpool spaces and permits will be reassigned accordingly.

71. It would be helpful to know the percentage utilization of the WMATA park and ride facilities noted on page 43, as has been done in Appendix D for many other facilities.

This information on WMATA park and ride utilization rates was not available.

72. Given the calculations of page 18, at the "90% level" there will be 34 "available" (vacant) parking spaces. A significant portion of those will likely be "disabled spaces" (based upon 48 being provided [per page 41] and the perception that it is very uncommon to have full utilization of disabled spaces) so perhaps there are a net 20 (nondisabled) spaces available. Spread over 8 floors in two separate (and access controlled) buildings, how easy will it be for someone to find one of those empty spaces anytime during a "90% occupancy" period?

All 48 employee ADA parking spaces will be located at the ground level in the South Garage in order to be located within shortest walking distance to building entry. Three additional visitor parking spaces will be ADA spaces in the North Garage. Adjustments have been made to the TMP to indicate the location of the spaces.

73. Later in the report [see pages 105-106] it is indicated that all parking spaces will be pre-assigned. What then becomes of the 34 "available" (unused) spaces as calculated in Table 2-4 (page 18)?

There will not be 34 unused spaces. See revised tables.

74. It appears the assumption has been made that anyone carpooling, vanpooling or slugging will do so in a vehicle that will subsequently be parked at BRAC. Is that realistic? To the extent it might be overly conservative, that would obviously free up some additional parking spaces.

The TMP analysis included the most conservative assumption.

75. This section indicates there are 3,747 parking spaces (per page 41: 2,032 in the north garage and 1,715 in the south). We have repeatedly been told there are 1,854 spaces in the south garage and 2,044 in the north garage (for a total of 3,898 spaces) - is this incorrect?

The number of parking spaces has changed during the design process. The number of spaces specified in the TMP correctly states the number that will be constructed.

76. How will WHS insure that ALL special events participants will conform to parking protocol? Pg. 107

As stated in the TMP, visitors will be strictly controlled and managed by PFPA. Every visitor will be required to register in advance and receive approval from PFPA, at least one day prior to visiting the site, and when arriving at the site, the visitor credentials must be verified by the PFPA security guard before being permitted into the visitor parking area. This protocol must be followed if they would like to drive to the special event.

WHS will develop standard operating procedures under the “Codes of Conduct” portion of the BRAC 133 Employee Orientation Handbook for special events protocol, including both parking and shuttle use.

A statement has been added to the TMP to clarify these points.

77. Is it intended that arriving vehicles be distributed differently (between the two garages) at different times of the day?

78. Section 3 - How is it determined which vehicles use which garage?

Comments #77-#78 are related to the one to one matching of permits to employees. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed: As discussed in Section 5.4.1, employee parking permits will be assigned to a garage and that permit will be valid only in that garage.

79. Tables suggest an excess of parking only when workforce is at or less than 90% for a given day. Also that there will only be a set number of permits (no greater than number of spaces). *I don't see how these two will match up when you have carpooling.* And what is the impact of having days when everyone needs to be there? Also the suggestion that there will be spots, though not guaranteed (on any given day) for some drivers. What happens when there turns out to be NO spot, after the driver arrives? What is the meaning of the section when you say you will have a backup plan and take care of this very problem?

The revised Table 2-4 explores multiple scenarios of trip generation possibilities and should address these questions.

80. The numbers seem to indicate that with the set aside parking there will only be 2,970 parking spaces for BRAC-133 employees. That would indicate a need for more (777) BRAC-133 employees to use other modes of transportation to reach the ‘goal’ stated in the TMP. How will this be accomplished? Pg. 41 & 42

The goal is to have a minimum of 40 percent non-SOV, which would result 60 percent (or less) of employees driving alone to BRAC 133. Having only 2,970 general use spaces and 48 ADA spaces, allows for only 47 percent of employees to drive alone, or 64 percent non-SOV, significantly exceeding the goal of 40 percent non-SOV. Adequate shuttle service and rideshare priority space allotments will help attain this goal. The revised Table 2-4 should clarify this.

81. On Page 98, what is the basis of allotting 5% parking for carpools and vanpools? Mode splits add up to be 8% for carpools and vanpools whereas description in Page 48 mentions the mode split to be 8.5%. What happens if a permit has been issued for a carpool vehicle and the carpool requirement is not fulfilled on certain days? How will this permit be monitored and enforced?

As discussed in Section 3.6.1, the minimum number of parking spaces designated for carpools and vanpools is driven by the LEED Gold requirements which require 5 percent to be set aside for carpools and vanpools. To encourage carpooling/vanpooling, WHS does not intent to cap carpool/vanpool spaces if demand exceeds five percent.

It is true that mode splits add up to 8 percent of employees, but with an average of 7 passengers per vehicle in each vanpool vehicle and with an average of 3 people per vehicle in every carpool vehicle, this 8 percent of employees accounts for a much smaller number of parking spaces.

Monitoring and enforcement of the carpool/vanpool program is discussed in Section 5.4.2.

82. In Section 5.4, Parking Management, the total number of parking permits will be set by the total number of parking spaces. This will cause under-utilization of the parking resource when staff is absent.

This was intentionally done to minimize the likelihood of spillover parking into neighboring communities and to further reduce traffic impacts on the surrounding community.

83. Parking permits will not be issued to staff who receives the mass transit benefit. Making limited parking available is important because one of the reasons staff may not accept the transit benefit is fear of where they will park on days when they must drive due to missing their bus, attending personal appointments, etc. Some allowance should be made so they can access parking a few times per month. Smart card garage access should be programmable for limited use, if electronic access is not used, punch cards or tear-off permits can be issued.

Smart cards will be used for access to the garage, employees still must call ahead and follow protocol to get a parking space- not all parking spaces will be allocated for permits; excess parking will be held for emergency use.

84. An explanation of why BRAC 133 cannot guarantee parking for flex time employees arriving after 9:00 AM needs to be provided in the TMP.

Currently over 40 percent of employees work a flexible work schedule and the TMP has goals to increase this participation rate by an additional 25 percent, which would mean that 65 percent of employees would be guaranteed a parking space. Guaranteeing parking for flex-time employees may result in an increase in SOV mode of travel.

Additionally, this TMP strategy only works if there is not a one-to-one permit process in place, as the flex-time parking in the 2003 TMP was only temporary and was lifted after 10am. Not having a one-to-one permit process would result in spillover parking.

Language has been included in the TMP to explain this.

Comments related to Building Support Staff/Shift Workers:

85. The BRAC 133 Transportation Management Plan offers an extensive and detailed document that provides analysis of projected commuting patterns and traffic generation and a comprehensive list of strategies to meet target modal splits. However, the TMP does not address transportation demands and impacts created by the non-DoD/contractor staff that would be employed at the same premises. Such staff would include food service, maintenance and housekeeping employees and are anticipated to form a significant number. By not addressing them anywhere in the plan, the plan implies a 100 percent transit mode share for these employees, which is very unrealistic. Accounting for these occupants would affect parking strategies, traffic generation, estimated transit ridership and transit service needs.
86. Who is responsible for the over site [sic] of the non-federal employees (30%)? Pg. 8
87. To what extent can DOD influence (or dictate?) relevant contractor behavior?
88. Para 2.2 (pg 8) mentions federal employees account for 69% of the total employees. We assume the remaining 31% are Contractor employees? Will the [sic] be treated equally with the federal employees in allocating parking passes? If not, how will they be accounted for and what will their impact be to the surrounding communities as they struggle to find parking places? (Also addressed in para 5.4 on page 105)
89. Contract personnel ought to be included [in ridematching pool].
90. Are three work shifts per day still planned for the BRAC-133 site? Pg. 47
91. What will the impact on traffic be when one shift leaves and one shift arrives? Will this happen within the same time frame?

Comments #85-#91 are related to non-federal workers and shift workers. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed:

- 31 percent of the building population of 6,409 represents contractor staff; these staff have been included in the analyses presented in the TMP.
 - Contractor staff will be permitted to be included in ridematching pools.
 - In addition to the 6,409 professional staff, there will be 150 other federal and non-federal employees at BRAC 133 providing a range of support functions, including security, IT, building management, and other service functions.
 - Each tenant organization is responsible for their non-federal employees, and all non-federal employees will be expected to follow the same protocol as federal employees. The TMP strategies will also apply to these employees. Each tenant organization will determine whether their contract employees will be eligible for parking permits. These employees will be able to utilize the DoD shuttle, as the proposed system has sufficient capacity to support these employees, even in the off-peak.
 - A description clarifying the aforementioned has been added to the TMP.
92. From a layman's perspective it seems strange not to at least try to survey all personnel, including those of the contractors (being 31% of the total site population). Given the severity of the transportation challenges and the seeming need to address the task on an almost individual-by-individual basis, why would one not want to, at a minimum, collect all zip codes rather than "interpolate" where 2,000 might live. Is there more to this than meets the eye?

It would obviously be preferable to obtain zip codes from all BRAC 133 employees, but it was not possible to obtain zip codes for contractor staff. As a result, federal zip codes were obtained and extrapolated to represent the larger population of employees. Sixty-nine percent of the population of employees is statistically representative of the larger population.

93. What arrangements are the various "agencies" making (in terms of report time) to accommodate tie-ups in getting to and into the buildings? And around during the day? Will this additional travel/wait time be on the government or the employee's time? What about for irregular needs (medical appts, eg.) Likely to be more than 4/yr (when added to other emergencies, work late, etc) for the Guaranteed ride option. Will employees just have to take the whole day off (on their own time) for something that should be only a few hours???

This will be at the discretion of the tenant organizations. We do not feel this will be a disincentive to transit usage.

94. What is capacity of the Mark Center Cafeteria? If inadequate to meet the needs of the Mark Center population, how will that impact mid-Day traffic?

The cafeteria is sized to serve the population of the Mark Center. Mid-day traffic impacts are not anticipated.

Comments related to Transit Improvements:

95. One gets the sense that transit providers are largely going to wait and see what happens, then determine their response. It also sounds as though WHS is, to some degree, planning (or being advised) to do the same. Will there, in fact, be a very pro-active approach to assessing the very specific needs and desires of individual personnel and attempting (in advance of opening) to marry those with transit providers?

96. More emphasis needs to be placed on ensuring systems and infrastructure is in place to make transit more attractive increase use. WHS-BRAC 133 will become a major regional transportation center for DoD employees in the I-395 corridor and employees transferring to other DoD facilities (Pentagon). Currently, transit is not an attractive option, and the influx of employees will make it even less appealing. The TMP should aggressively provide transit infrastructure to accommodate their employees and make transit a viable option.

97. 'WMATA staff and transit staff from the City of Alexandria have identified a number of possible transit improvements that could be implemented to serve the BRAC-133 population...' What are these and when would they be implemented? Pg. 35, Pg. 36.

Comments #95-#97 are related to concerns about transit improvements. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed in comments #80-#81:

- WHS is engaged in ongoing discussions with a variety of service providers to establish service to the Mark Center prior to occupancy.

- BRAC 133 is not intended to be a regional hub for DoD employees. The TMP does aggressively provide transit infrastructure through a robust DoD shuttle system and through support of other non-SOV options.
- DoD is evaluating the potential for local and regional service providers to provide part or all of the DoD Mark Center shuttle service. Decisions will be based on efficiency and cost effectiveness. As the result of previous discussion with the City, Van Dorn is not being considered as a shuttle destination. The existing frequency of the Van Dorn Metro Station DASH routes are considered adequate for the projected demand.
- Recent discussions between the Army and the City of Alexandria are intended to implement the recommendations contained in Table 3-2. The TMP has been adjusted to include all transit improvements agreed to. WHS will continue discussions with DASH and WMATA concerning possible route enhancements. Decisions will be made based on whether efficiency and effectiveness gains can be achieved.

98. The additional employees possibly using public transit will strain existing capacity, adversely impacting current service for Alexandria residents, with no additional reimbursement to the City or WMATA for increased public transit service.

The TMP assumes that 5 percent of employees will utilize local transit service. Based on discussions with transit providers regarding existing capacity on routes that currently provide service within ½ mile of BRAC 133, there is sufficient capacity to support this future level of ridership. Regarding reimbursement, BRAC 133 employees will pay for their ride like all other riders on public transit.

99. Coordination with the WMATA study should be included in the TMP. This would include recommendation on public transportation modifications.

100. The TMP should reference and be consistent/coordinated with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's (WMATA) "Transit Service Impacts of the Base Realignment and Closure Recommendations in the Metropolitan Washington Region" Draft Report dated June 2010. The draft report outlines existing and proposed transit services including local bus, express bus and shuttle proposals servicing the Mark Center area. A copy of the "BRAC 133 (Mark Center)" section in the draft report is attached to this letter.

Comments #99-#100 are related to non-federal workers and shift workers. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed:

- The TMP does reference coordination with WMATA and references the WMATA study (see Section 3.3.2 with a citation to the study on Table 3-2). The revised TMP includes a revised reference to the final report issued in June (after the public review version of the TMP was released). DoD intends to integrate its shuttle plan with WMATA routes and other service provider routes in the Mark Center area as it implements the TMP.

Comments related to the Transportation Center:

101. The plan indicates that there will be only five bays at the Transportation Center to accommodate DoD shuttles, as well as Dash, Metro, and privately operated buses. The number of bays should be expanded to reduce the likelihood of service delays and traffic spillback.

102. Memorandum: Mark Center Transit Center, Wells and Associates, April 2009 projects the Mark Center Transportation Center could potentially be served by 69 buses including public transit vehicles and DoD shuttles during the AM and PM peak hours. The large number of buses and shuttles will potentially lead to back-up and delays in service and contribute to a significant number of trips to and from the WHS-BRAC-133 Transportation Center at Mark Center. Consequently, DoD should re-evaluate the size of the transit center to accommodate the large number of buses and shuttles for DoD and contractor employees living in the I-395 corridor.

Comments #101-#102 are related to transportation center bus bays. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed in comments #84-#85: As discussed in Section 5.5.4, expanding the Transportation Center is something that will be considered in the future if needed. The capacity of the bus bays are sufficient as according to the requirements of TCRP Report 100: Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual. The current five bus bays also have excess capacity to support additional service.

Comments related to LEED Certification:

103. "As the building is LEED Gold certified..." It is? - 15 months before completion?
104. The plan indicates that the BRAC-133 office complex is LEED Gold certified. Has this certification been issued, and is it for both the office towers and the parking facilities?

Comments #103-#104 are related to a comment regarding LEED certification in the TMP. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed in comments #103-104:

- The building has not yet received LEED Gold Certification.
- This statement has been reworded to state that the building is being designed to meet LEED Gold standards and requirements for "Gold" level certification.

Comments related to Emergency Response:

105. As stated in the last paragraph on page 89, *the traffic demand exceeds the available capacity that will result in spillover and traffic overflow that extends into downstream/upstream intersections impeding corridor wide traffic flow and operations*. In an emergency situation (terror attack, bombing etc.) how will emergency personnel be able to get to the site with the equipment needed to aid the injured? At peak AM and PM times how will emergency crews get to somebody having a heart attack?

106. Access issues addressed?

Comments #105-#106 are related to a comment regarding emergency response access. The following consolidated response addresses the concerns addressed in comments #88-89:

- It is not expected that response times will be significantly affected as emergency service personnel are experienced at maneuvering through congested conditions.
- PFPA personnel located on site are also trained in emergency response to handle emergencies until other emergency response personnel arrive to the scene.

Comments related to Site Information:

107. For the record, the City of Alexandria did not master-plan this site "for a development of this size and character":

- The buildings are as much as 95 feet taller than the SUP called for (245 feet vs. 150 feet);
- The total footprint covers 77% more area than the SUP called for (210,200 sq. ft. vs. 118,850 sq. ft.);
- The gross square footage of the buildings is 30% more than the SUP called for (1,800,000 sq. ft. vs. 1,382,730 sq. ft.)

The phrase "for a development of this size and character" has been removed from the TMP.

108. On page ES-3, what is meant by "BRAC growth" in the middle of the page? Are there more buildings planned for the BRAC-133 site?

"BRAC growth" refers to the projected trips associated with the BRAC 133 development. There are no plans for additional construction on the BRAC-133 site.

109. What is meant by 'proper alignment with *future development* plans in this area'? Pg. 3

The intent of this statement is to indicate that the TMP considered the City ordinances which will ensure that the development fits in with the City's future development plans.

110. What is the 'proposed IDA Building', first line on page 64?

IDA is expanding. Although the opening date is not known at this time, it is expected to be occurring at some point in the near future. The TMP includes these trips to be parallel with all previous traffic studies which included these new expected trips.

111. As the TMP considers traffic flow into and out of the Mark Center, it is important to include traffic flow and patterns from the existing tenants: Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA), Center for Naval Analysis (CNA), the Hilton employees and guests, and the medical/commercial building.

The baseline traffic analysis includes all existing traffic into and out of Mark Center including commercial, residential, and pass-thru traffic. As with all other traffic studies, this data was obtained from traffic counts conducted as part of a prior traffic study as discussed in Section 4.3.1.

Comments related to Mode Split:

112. It is anticipated that 23%, 1474 employees, will be using the Virginia Railway Express (VRE) to get to and from work. The analysis only includes the VRE station at the King Street Metro station. The TMP fails to analyze the potential impact of this increase on VRE service, the Metro station, and public and shuttle service to the WHS-BRAC Office Complex at Mark Center.

The TMP actually assumes that 23 percent of employees will ride "rail" as a whole, which includes both Metrorail and VRE. The vast majority of these employees are expected to take Metrorail (only 3 percent

utilize VRE as their primary mode today while an additional 3.6 percent use it along with other modes, and these numbers are expected to remain fairly constant).

113. Pg ES-2 - To what degree was "expected mode choice" of personnel solicited and analyzed? We had previously understood this information was not being requested.

WHS did ask employees about their expected mode choice on the survey conducted in the Fall of 2009. However, since this survey was conducted early-on in the process, many employees were not yet aware of commute options available at Mark Center at the time of the survey. As a result, this information was considered in projecting mode split, but was not the only factor. The projected mode splits in the TMP (presented in Section 2.3.2) are based on a variety of factors, only one of which is the self-reported "anticipated mode choice".

114. Pg ES-2 - The noted expected "mode splits" total 100% so apparently this list does not include multiple modes but rather is a tabulation of the (final) mode people will use to actually arrive at the BRAC site. However, 23% of the personnel (1,474 people) are projected to reach "the BRAC-133 site" via rail - but rail does not serve the site?

This is correct that the modes listed here represent the last mode that employees would use when arriving at the site. In the draft TMP, those represented under the mode "Rail Transit" actually represented those who would take rail and then the DoD shuttle. This information is now presented in a different way to make it more clear.

115. Pg ES-2 - "The proposed DOD shuttle(s)...from key Metrorail stations...is (are) expected to serve...a total of 2,970 commuters during the peak period..." But the preceding table indicated only 1,474 people in total would make use of (Metro)rail.

2,970 represents the total peak period capacity (i.e., over the course of the 3 peak hours during the AM or PM peak period) of the DoD shuttle system.

116. Again, are the "anticipated mode choices" based upon future preferences as stated by surveyed personnel or were the numbers projected based upon current mode choices?

The "anticipated mode choices" presented in Table 2-3 present only the mode choice that employees believed they would take when responding to the survey conducted in the Fall of 2009. Since this survey was conducted early-on in the process, and many employees may not have even been aware of commute options available at Mark Center at the time of the survey, the projected mode splits in the TMP (presented in Section 2.3.2) are actually quite different from these and are based on a variety of factors, only one of which is the self-reported "anticipated mode choice".

117. The tabulation in section 2.3.2 ("mode choice splits") totals 100%. One then assumes that the focus of these projections is (for those that make use of more than one mode) the final mode used to arrive at BRAC-133 site?

This is correct that the modes listed here represent the last mode that employees would use when arriving at the site. In the draft TMP, those represented under the mode "Rail Transit" actually represented those who would take rail and then the DoD shuttle. This information is now presented in a different way to make it more clear.

118. What does it mean to have "capacity to support a 20 to 40 percent mode split"?

The goal of "providing capacity to support a 20 to 40 percent mode split" means that one of WHS's goals in establishing the DoD shuttle was to provide capacity to serve at a minimum, 20 percent of BRAC 133 employees, and a maximum of up to 40 percent of BRAC 133 employees.

119. Also, I think the transit use projections are high. Mark Center isn't well service by transit. The Mark Center shuttle and the proposed DoD shuttle to Metro and VRE will help, but there isn't much in the way of bus service to Mark Center. The TMP basis a lot of the projected transit use on the number of existing employees that use transit now. However, the existing employees work at sites that have much better transit access and, for may are one-seat rides. I doubt many people will take the bus to the apartment complex on the other side of Seminary Road and walk to the facility - too dangerous and too long of a walk

With the extensive shuttle system planned, employee interest towards shuttle service and the limited availability of parking at and near BRAC 133, DoD believes that the transit projections are appropriate.

120. The vanpool use projection may be a bit high due to DoD's transit/vanpool benefit program that prohibits employees riding in vanpools operated by non-profit vanpool companies from receiving the benefit. Many of the vanpool companies in Virginia are non-profit. DoD needs to change their policy on this in order to have more employees use vanpools. Also, there policy is incorrect and may violate federal rules by discriminating against non-profit vanpool companies.

DoD believes that the vanpool projections are appropriate; however this is true that for purposes of the mass transportation benefit incentive, the Department of Defense distinguishes between vanpools operated for profit and those operated on a non-profit basis. Status as a profit or non-profit enterprise is determined under IRS regulations. The only vanpools for which eligible employees can use transit benefit vouchers are vanpools operated "for profit." Vanpools operated on a non-profit basis are not "qualified means of transportation" under the applicable DoD Instruction governing this benefit.

121. Again, it seems that focus was placed on how employees currently get to work and the "commute patterns" they currently use. Why would focus not be placed primarily on employees' future expectations, especially given that (a) rail, currently used by many, will no longer be an option to reach their final destination and (b) whereas rail is confined to specific routes, travel by road offers innumerable possibilities to most commuters and it is precisely the traffic conditions on those roads (and resultant route choices) that one is attempting to address?

As discussed in Section 2.3.1 (pg 14 following Table 2-3) the projected mode split was determined based on a variety of factors. Current mode use was not the primary factor, but was rather one of many factors. Inputs used to develop mode split and trip generation were as follows:

- Employee origin zip codes
- Modes based on what was viable or feasible for employees based on where they live
- Regional commute patterns from various sources
- Current mode use of employees and anticipated mode use in the future (WHS 2009 employee survey)
 - Sense of how "open" employees were to alternate modes of travel
 - Insight into which bus routes and rail lines employees use

122. Second, the Plan needs to consider, to the extent it has not already done so, the rush-hour impact of proposed vanpool and bus (and rail to bus) transit essential to accommodate those commuters that will not drive, slug, walk, or bike.

The traffic analysis conducted with the projected BRAC and IDA trips (termed “Projected 2011 with BRAC and IDA”) does include all trips, not just SOV trips. See Figure 2-4.

123. The other modes of transportation, van pools, shuttles, car pools are not incorporated into an overall system plan and will only add to the traffic congestion on roads and streets currently and projected to be operating at unacceptable levels of service.

The traffic analysis conducted with the projected BRAC and IDA trips (termed “Projected 2011 with BRAC and IDA”) does include all trips, not just SOV trips. See Figure 2-4.

124. Page 14 - Although based on the survey results, would the anticipated mode choice percentage be realistic considering the changes in accessibility to the transit stations adjacent to the Mark Center site when compared to the existing employment center location? According to Table 2-3, it would result in over 115 bikers and 123 people walking. In case the mode choice percentage for transit and carpool/vanpool can't be met due to various reasons, what would be the alternative plan?

The “anticipated mode choice” presented in Table 2-3 presents only the mode choice that employees believed they would take when responding to the survey conducted in the Fall of 2009. Since this survey was conducted early-on in the process, and many employees may not have even been aware of commute options available at Mark Center at the time of the survey, the projected mode splits in the TMP (presented in Section 2.3.2) are actually quite different from these and are based on a variety of factors, only one of which is the self-reported “anticipated mode choice”. As discussed in Section 6, WHS will be monitoring mode share over time and making adjustments to the shuttle service and to the ways in which they implement the various TDM strategies to cause a shift in mode choice as needed.

125. In Table 2-4, the source or methodology used for the applied rideshare vehicle occupancies of carpool (2.3), vanpool (7.0) and slugging (3.0) should be provided.

A source for these assumptions has been added.

TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM COMMENTS

Comments related to Parking Pricing:

126. On the other hand, the document (as others have pointed out) does not get into the issue of paid parking. Simply put, many (if not most) of the WHS staff who will be moved to Mark Center are already paying for parking, chiefly market pricing. Does anyone really think that not charging them will help them shift to a non-drive alone mode???
127. The plan states that “the BRAC-133 TMP will consider the Travel Demand Management Plan strategies (promoted by the City) detailed in the existing Mark Center Plaza 1A and 1B TMP (developed March 31, 2003) and meet or exceed the outcome of the strategies.” One key feature in the City’s Mark Center Plaza TMP is the requirement to charge market rates for parking at the site. The community strongly advocated for this requirement in order to reduce the volume of single-occupant vehicles and the requirement is an integral part of the Special Use Permit for the site. The BRAC-133 TMP needs to address this issue.
128. The TMP also fails to analyze impacts of providing free parking to employees and contractors at the WHS-BRAC Office Complex-Mark Center. Since employees are being consolidated from private leased space where they paid for parking, and since this facility is in an urban area, employees should be charged market rate for parking. This would provide additional incentives for building and providing better transit options.
129. The community has expressed concerns regarding the free parking provided to employees, making it less attractive and less likely employees will take public or private transit.
130. The TDM program includes most of the usual elements used by large employers in the region; these coupled with the transit subsidies available to most BRAC 133 staff will be helpful in increasing non-SOV share. However, in a location this far from rail transit, it will be a challenge to meet the 40% non-SOV goal. Other measures should be considered to support this goal. Parking pricing could help, but it is understood that pricing is not allowed as a matter of regulation or law. (It may be worth inquiring if the administrative cost of issuing permits could be recouped. This would provide further incentive to other modes.)

Comments #126-#130 are related to the one to one matching of permits to employees. The following consolidated response addresses the above concerns: As a matter of policy, DoD will not be charging employees for parking and has discussed this with the City of Alexandria. The limited parking availability at BRAC 133 along with the extensive TDM program will provide significant incentive for employees to use non-SOV modes of travel to the site.

Comments related to the Bicycle Program:

131. The "Bicycle Safe Route" from the Seminary is arguably not a safe route. Bicyclist must use the sidewalk, and there are areas near Hammond School where there is no curb break, requiring a bicyclist to dismount to cross a street or driveway. Biking in the area of I-395, even with a pedestrian ramp, is dangerous because of the merging action. If you use the pedestrian bridge to Southern Towers there are steps.
132. The on street-on sidewalk bicycle routes included in the Appendix are not routes normally taken by the few bicyclist brave enough to confront steep hills and traffic congestion. Since there are no attractive biking options, Appendix E is misleading.
133. Bicycle paths do not service the WHS-BRAC-133 Office Complex. They are nearly a mile away and the hilly terrain north and south on Beauregard, as well as the roadway congestion, makes bicycling a very unsafe, and unattractive option.
134. I work in Mark Center and commute by bicycle several days a week, whenever I can. I have done so for years. The flaw in the transportation plan with respect to bicycling is not the number of racks or the availability of showers, but the lack of bicycle access to the site. Only those who are comfortable riding in heavy traffic can get there now and the situation is likely to get worse. From no direction is bicycling easy and I don't consider riding on sidewalks an option. That is safe for neither bicycles nor pedestrians and none of the sidewalks in the area is wide enough or recognized for mixed use. Bicycles must and should be able to use the roadways.

From the southeast, once you are past Howard Road, you are riding among fast moving cars along Seminary (this is the route I take). The Plan suggests that "there is a pedestrian/bicycle bridge on the right side of Seminary Road going northbound that crosses over I-395." The sidewalk on the bridge is narrow, has a high drop on the road side, and cannot handle a bicycle and a pedestrian at the same time. I have no problems with this route now, but if the HOV lanes from 395 empty onto this bridge, it will be very difficult for bicycles to get to the left lane to turn into Mark Center Drive.

From the northwest, Seminary has four narrow lanes that make it difficult for cars to pass bicyclists safely. Beauregard street to the northeast is rideable, but only for those skilled in traffic. From the southwest, one can come up Chambliss street. I am not familiar with that route but at least one of my colleagues takes it. I am not sure where one cuts over to Mark Center.

It is not surprising that Table 5-2 lists neither Beauregard nor Seminary as a bicycle route in spite of what the figures in Appendix E might imply. If the Plan were serious regarding bicycling as mode of transportation, there would be more in the Plan regarding road improvements to ensure bicycle access; I haven't read the whole thing from cover to cover, but, in spite of the discussion of bicycle friendly improvements on the site, there is little regarding improvements in access to the site, and from what I can tell of the proposed roadway modifications, the obstacles to bicycle commuting will increase. I hope these comments are helpful, and I am happy to provide any additional information that I can.

135. The report provided optional bike paths of which two are unfeasible:
- a. E-1 (Lacy Route from Columbia Pike) has a steep hill and goes through Fairfax/City of Alexandria neighborhoods without sidewalks/dedicated bike lanes of which are presently

used as cut-through vehicle routes. E-1 illustrates the most roundabout way I have seen to go from Glen Hills Park to the Mark Center properties.

- b. N. Beauregard St. is the most likely northbound route from N. Morgan St. until the Holmes Crossing is completed. Realize, as well, that during the school year, the combination of bikers and elementary school children on the same sidewalks/sides of roads could be dangerous. There are approximately 1400 elementary children who attend Ramsey and John Adams Elementary Schools.

Comments #131-#135 are related to bicycle access and safety as referenced in the TMP. As a result of these comments, the TMP has been amended to include information and/or clarification on the following points:

- Adjustments have been made to the TMP to remove any instances of the word “safe” and to remove language referring to the use of sidewalks by bicycles.
- DoD is not funding offsite bicycle access improvements. Onsite safety improvements will be coordinated between the City Biking and Pedestrian Coordinator and the WHS Transportation Coordinator(s). The TMP will not include details or language on the safety examination.
- WHS will closely monitor the use of bicycles as one of its transportation demand management strategies and if the demand demonstrates a business case for participation in regional bike sharing programs, it will examine whether appropriated funds can be legally used for this purpose.

Comments related to Citizen Outreach:

136. What is the WHS planned ‘outreach to residents’? Pg. 3

WHS will continue outreach to the community through continued coordination with the City of Alexandria and citizens through the BRAC Advisory Group.

137. How will the Washington Headquarters Services (WHS) support and assist the neighborhood residents of the BRAC-133 site? Pg ES-3

The intent of Section 5 is to present TDM strategies that will decrease SOV travel to the site, which will reduce impact to the surrounding community. One of the two goals of the TMP directly ties to the neighboring community. The first goal states, “...in order to minimize traffic impacts on the neighboring community.”

138. When will community members receive the ‘hotline’ number to voice a complaint about frequent parking violations? PG. 107

The hotline will be available prior to building occupancy.

139. How and when would the surrounding community be informed of the expanding of the Mark Center Transportation Center? It seems this would further increase traffic congestion in the Mark Center area. Pg. 110

Any possible expansion of the Mark Center Transportation Center would be coordinated with the City of Alexandria, and it is anticipated that the City would invite participation from citizens.

140. How will 'continued and ongoing communication with area residents' take place once the site is occupied? Will there be a phone number for residents to call when they need assistance with a BRAC-133 issue (parking, trash, etc.)? Pg. 3

BRAC 133 will maintain a BRAC 133 hotline. This is covered in Section 5.4.3 (pg 107) of the TMP.

141. There is no reference in the TMP that sufficient coordination has occurred with affected jurisdictions.

Coordination with neighboring jurisdictions is discussed in Section 3.3.2 on pg 35. WHS will be conducting ongoing coordination with jurisdictions as discussed throughout Section 5.

142. Where are residents and neighboring communities in Fig. 2-1: Organizational Chart? Pg. 8
This chart presents the organizations involved in developing and managing the property.

Comments related to the Action Plan/Schedule:

143. Finally, when the plan is delivered in its final approved form, time to implement its recommendations and the impact of delays must be carefully weighed. Accordingly the final version should address the full set of recommend actions, identify steps DoD must take to implement, and provide a critical timeline for implementation of each essential plan component.

144. Throughout the Transportation Management Plan (TMP), dates are identified for some activities to occur, but no consolidated schedule that would track implementation of the plan is provided. It would be helpful that a consolidated schedule for all time sensitive activities be included as a separate attachment.

145. To what extent has the timeline been given detailed attention?

Comments #143-#145 are related to the lack of a consolidated timeline in the TMP. As a result of these comments, the TMP has been amended to include information and/or clarification on the following points:

- The TMP has deadlines and milestones within each subsection for when initiatives will be implemented.
- Adjustments have been made to the TMP to consolidate critical milestones and dates for implementation of the TMP strategies onto one timeline for ease of reference.

Comments related to TMP Monitoring, Evaluation, and Enforcement:

146. In Sec. 6, Monitoring and Evaluation, the City of Alexandria should have a consultation or approval role in accepting the annual report and/or amending the TMP.

As stated in the TMP, the Transportation Coordinator(s) must liaise with the City on a regular basis, including during the compilation of the evaluation report and in the event the TMP is amended. The City will be kept in regular communication with the Transportation Coordinator(s).

147. The TMP should stress the need for conducting employee survey and monitoring more frequently than the proposed biannual basis, during the initial year of the relocation to address any deficiencies and issues that may arise during this time.

WHS will conduct two surveys in the first year. This process will be flexible according to changing needs during the first year. An adjustment has been made to the TMP to clarify this.

148. A number of activities identified in the TMP address coordination with the City of Alexandria. Due to the proximity of this site to Fairfax County and the potential impacts not only to the local transportation network in the County along with the I-395 corridor and associated interchanges, Fairfax County should be included in all coordination activities during the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the TMP.

It is the recommendation of DoD and WHS that any coordination with other jurisdictions be done through the City of Alexandria. WHS is coordinating with Fairfax County on transit and shuttle route planning. Implementation and monitoring of the TMP will be handled by DoD in coordination with the City of Alexandria.

149. What are the ‘measures to monitor achievement of goals and to adjust the SOV trip reduction strategies, as needed’? Pg. 3

This is covered in Section 5, TDM Strategies.

150. To the extent that initial goals are not achieved within a reasonable timeframe, what happens?

151. Without active engagement by the City of Alexandria and improved flexibility and cooperation by DoD officials, there is no assurance to the community or the City of Alexandria that “Senior Army and DoD leadership will maintain situational awareness of the effectiveness of the TMP and will operationally support ongoing efforts to achieve the goals of the TMP (p.121).”

Comments #150-#151 are related to the TMP enforcement. As a result of these comments, the TMP has been amended to include information and/or clarification on the following points:

- We are confident in the abilities of WHS to meet the goals of the TMP given that the DoD shuttle system will provide such extensive service with capacity for 45 percent of the building population, combined with the fact that the building will have such limited parking available, and finally given that WHS will be implementing a variety of other comprehensive TDM strategies. WHS will be evaluating achievement of goals over time (and formally with each Evaluation Report), and will be setting new goals over time based on findings.
- The TMP has been updated to include language that will demonstrate examples of how goals will be assessed and rectified if not met, (i.e., if transit ridership goals are not met, WHS will reexamine the DoD shuttle plan and make changes to increase ridership, etc.)

152. Does WHS have any role in enforcing "local" area parking restrictions?

153. Who is responsible for enforcing the parking rules for BRAC-133 employees in residential and business areas?

154. What are the plans for ‘spillover’ parking? Pg. 17

155. Page 107 – 5.4.3 – Overflow Management- Issuing resident and guest parking permits to residential community members and implementing a strict towing policy for vehicles not displaying a permit is a suggested strategy. What are the current plans for initiating this strategy in surrounding neighborhoods?

Comments #152-#155 are related to the local area parking enforcement. As a result of these comments, the TMP has been amended to include information and/or clarification on the following points:

- The BRAC 133 TMP and its managing entities will not be responsible for managing overflow parking outside of BRAC 133 property and garages. As stated in Section 5.4.3, it will be the responsibility of neighboring properties to mitigate overflow. This section of the TMP notes strategies that are currently in place or that are in the works, and suggests strategies that neighboring properties can implement in order to mitigate the effects of spillover parking.

Comments related to Incentive Programs:

156. Are there any incentive programs planned for employees not using SOV for their commute?

Employees using mass transit for their commute are eligible for the Federal transit subsidy program. Employees will also have access to the DoD-funded shuttle system. Carpools and vanpools will be guaranteed a parking space and will receive priority parking (i.e., most convenient parking spaces in the garages). Other incentives/rewards programs are not permitted.

Comments related to TDM Programs:

157. Para 5.1 says "...the BRAC 133 TMP will consider the TDM strategies detailed in the existing Mark Center Plaza 1A and 1B TMP (developed March 31, 2003)..." Using a 2003 document is absolutely unacceptable. Most of the previous studies were flawed, biased, superficial...or a combination of the above. Plus, traffic conditions have changed significantly since 2003. The final TMP must:

- Take into account current conditions
- Have accurate data
- Consider existing and planned infrastructure capacity
- Consider future development plans and
- Allow time for public review and comment

The intention of this statement was to make clear the fact that this TMP meets and exceeds the plans laid out in the previous TMP approved by the City. It is not the intent to imply that the prior TMP served as the basis for the current TMP.

158. The plan's discussion of the BRAC-133 Employee Orientation Handbook should highlight the fact that there will be restricted parking at the Southern Towers complex and in all of the nearby residential neighborhoods.

Adjustments have been made to TMP language on the Orientation Handbook to include language on parking restrictions both at BRAC 133 and in neighboring commercial properties and residential neighborhoods.

159. Guaranteed ride program. What happens to the employee who needs to work added hours more frequently than 4 times a year? (more typical situation, I would suspect). Also, not conducive to taking public transportation at a late hour(or after the shuttles end).

The regional Guaranteed Ride Home Program rules only allow for four free rides per year. If an employee exceeds this quota, the employee can still call the Guaranteed Ride Home Program number to arrange a ride for which the employee will need to pay the cost of the ride. The shuttle schedule will be planned accordingly in order to accommodate to employee schedules as indicated by tenant organizations.

160. Is there a contemplated seasonality to walking/biking?

Yes, for many employees bicycling and/or walking is a seasonal travel solution. However, employees living within walking/bicycling distance may also elect to arrange for a carpool ride, bus, taxi ride, and/or to utilize a BRAC 133 shuttle in order to get to the site during inclement weather.

161. Hopefully [ridematching software] would not be confined just to matching two automobile commuters but to all modes of transportation so, for example, bus companies could be made aware of opportunities to provide additional and valued services.

Ridematching software will be open to any employee (Federal or contractor) who desires to be put into the ridematching database. The intent of the software is only to match individuals to a carpool or vanpool; however, if there is an abundance of employees interested in ridematching who live in close proximity to one another, the Transportation Coordinator would also be made aware of an opportunity to develop a buspool from the software as well.

162. The plan needs more emphasis telework and commit DoD to meeting the federal telework goals.

The City has provided additional steps for developing the telecommute program. USACE/WHS will be coordinating with the state of Telework!VA statewide telework coordinator to help tenant organizations develop more definitive policies.

163. Based on the expected task the TMP coordinator will need to carry out, senior staff along with supporting staffs with transportation management expertise would be needed. Also, it is not mentioned anywhere in the TMP as to when the TMP coordinator is planned to be hired.

The TMP Coordinator(s) will be supported and supervised by WHS Transportation Management Program Office staff, which will include senior management as well as support personnel. The TMP states that that the TMP coordinator will be hired 9 months prior to relocation (see Section 5.3.1)

164. Individualized marketing and personal travel planning should be considered to increase the share on non-SOV commuters. Individualized marketing (aka IndiMark or TravelSmart) involves identifying and targeting marketing to transportation users who have access to modes other than driving alone and are willing to try these options. Personal travel planning is offered on a one-on-one consultation basis to encourage and plan alternative transportation travel. These outreach methods can be supportive of any alternative mode or TDM mitigation. Most IM demonstration projects have been conducted at the community level (public agency outreach to residents). The data indicates increase in non-SOV ridership of 5 to 10 percent. Here are two of the studies: http://www.fta.dot.gov/index_4402.html and <http://www.socialdata.de/info/IndiMark.pdf>

- Although it is a new concept, there has been some success in workplace-based individual marketing: Stanford University (<http://transportation.stanford.edu/>) and Portland's SmartTrips Downtown program
- <http://www.portlandonline.com/TRANSPORTATION/index.cfm?c=43820>) are two notable examples.

Individualized travel planning is referred to as personalized commute assistance throughout Section 5 of the TMP. It is a major responsibility of the transportation coordinator(s) to provide individualized travel planning.

Comments related to Slugging:

165. The plan refers to a "pedestrian refuge area to promote slugging." (pg ES-2). Recommend the Plan flesh out this refuge area to better analyze projected traffic flow and impact. In particular, recommend it review the Pentagon refuge area to determine how to best organize and understand projected traffic flow. The Pentagon slugging area encompasses a significant amount of land and various allocation of slugging locations to maximize thru-put and matching of vehicle slug-lines and individual sluggees. In particular they try differentiate between sluggees heading west (I-66); those to the Springfield area ((-395) and those further south toward Prince William County/Fredericksburg (I-95).

166. It is highly questionable whether the flow of slug lines within the constricted space available within the Mark Center will be conducive to efficient and effective slugging. A deeper analysis and understanding of this process is highly recommended. (Slugging is also addressed in para 5.6.3 on pg 112...but our comments remain valid).

Comments #165-#166 are related to the slug queuing area. As a result of these comments, the TMP has been amended to include information and/or clarification on the following points:

- Usage of the slug area is difficult to predict at this time and will likely change over time. WHS will observe operations over time in and around the Transportation Center and the slug area and may choose in the future to alter shuttle routes or move the slug area to a different location.
- The number of slugs originating at Mark Center will be substantially less than the Pentagon since the Pentagon serves as a central hub for slugging.
- Anecdotal evidence suggests that for long-distance commuters (from Fairfax County and areas south), HOV access to the Mark Center via the Pentagon provides significantly better travel time as compared to using the general purpose lanes.

167. The plan fails to identify where on the site safe queuing for "slugging" can occur.

Figure 3-4 in Section 3.2.4 identifies the slug queuing area.

168. If someone "slugs" or transports others to somewhere other than BRAC-133 and arrives at BRAC as an SOV, do they get "credit" for being an HOV? If they leave BRAC empty with the intention of picking up "sluggers" even on the Mark Center site, how does that get substantiated or how do they get credit for it?

Unfortunately slugs cannot be granted carpool/vanpool privileges as slugging is an informal commute mode and is therefore difficult to predict and monitor. BRAC 133 employees who pick up slugs must have a general use parking permit in order to be a slug driver.

169. The 3% slugging use by creating a slug line is optimistic. Slugging works for the Pentagon and DC because there is density and access to transit to get to other destinations. I don't there will be that much slugging. Plus, there is no HOV lane access to the facility. Carpooling and vanpooling will also be hurt by the lack HOV lane access.

Slugging is an informal commute mode and is therefore difficult to predict. How slugging is expected to occur is discussed in Section 2.3 under “Slug” and in Section 3.4.

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS COMMENTS

Comments related to Study Area Limits:

170. Why is Library Lane used as a marker when it is on the east side of 395? Pg. 22

The intersection is located within 0.5 miles of the I-395 ramps/Seminary Road interchange and had to be included to develop an accurate analysis of the traffic operations.

171. What if the 'proposed internal and external roadway improvements that will be in-place to serve the opening day traffic demand' do not work? Is there a contingency plan? Pg. 24

VDOT is currently analyzing other short-term improvements proposed by the BRAC Advisory Group that include additional roadway and signal improvements. In addition, a direct HOV access from I-395 northbound to Seminary Road is currently being analyzed by VDOT and City of Alexandria for approval and funding.

172. Figure 2-2 - It would be helpful to see some figures with major roadways clearly overlaid on the employee distribution.

At this scale it would be impossible to showcase major roadways (beyond those already shown, which is all interstates) without cluttering the diagram.

173. Table 4-10 & 4-11 (Page 75, 76): Model throughput shows majority of the demand volume being accommodated for 2011 baseline condition without improvement conditions, showing LOS D or better for AM and LOS E or better or PM peak conditions. Would this be realistic considering the current level of congestion that is occurring along the corridor?

The model is restricted by the limits of the study area. However, Section 4.4.2 makes note of the existing congestion along I-395 mainline and interchanges adjacent to the Seminary Road interchange and the need for an overall analysis. Reference should be made to the VDOT IJR since it includes the adjacent I-395 interchanges of Duke Street/Little River Turnpike and King Street along I-395.

Comments related to Site Access:

174. On page 56, third paragraph, it is stated "A single lane HOV ramp with a 450 foot long acceleration (or deceleration) lane allows direct access to Seminary Road from the north" I do not believe this is accurate. There is not an HOV ramp access to Seminary Rd. *'from the north'*. The HOV ramp *heads north*.

The intent of this phrase was to clarify that the HOV access ramp is only on the north side of the overpass. This has been revised in the TMP to clarify.

175. A correction is needed on page 65. '...the I-95/395 HOV lanes, exit at the Pentagon, and turn around to travel along I-395 northbound (should be southbound) GP lanes to Mark Center.

176. One takes I-395 southbound (not "northbound") to reach Mark Center from the Pentagon. The HOV ramp from Seminary Road heads to the north in the morning and south in the evening.

To answer questions #175-#176: This error has been corrected in the TMP.

177. (ES-3) "A direct HOV access ramp plan from I-395 to Mark Center is also currently being evaluated by VDOT." I am assuming this is a reference to the long-discussed "direct access" into Mark Center as opposed to "Alternatives F and G" which are currently on the table but which feed into Seminary Road. So, with respect to "direct access", as I understand the use of the term on page ES-3, we have repeatedly been told that this option is no longer under consideration and is not a possibility.

This was an error. The intention was to refer to the direct HOV access ramp to Seminary Road that is under consideration by VDOT. Text has been revised to read "A direct HOV access ramp plan from I-395 to Seminary Road is also currently being evaluated by VDOT."

178. It would be helpful if all site plans, maps, road diagrams, etc. were oriented in the same direction, preferably with north at the top of the page, as we are generally accustomed to seeing.

Some of the maps and figures were oriented so for maximum legibility. The road diagrams will be reoriented where possible.

179. (22) The Seminary Road/Mark Center Drive intersection is west (or northwest) of the site, not east of it.

Text has been revised.

180. It would seem relevant to note that the "southbound auxiliary lane" of I-395 does not, in fact, extend entirely from King to Duke but merges to the left just before the exit ramp to eastbound Duke (and ramp from Duke to southbound I-395) causing major traffic issues.

Text has been added to the report.

181. Item 4 - "...site access (to Mark Center Drive) will be allowed for eastbound Seminary Road traffic only." Also for vehicles southbound out of Southern Towers, correct?

Yes; the TMP has been revised to clarify this point.

182. Page 23 "Only the westbound Seminary Road traffic can legally execute left turns at Mark Center Drive" - to do so (and be in the correct lane) vehicles must have already been on Seminary to the east of I-395; vehicles which exited I-395 at Seminary cannot/will not be able to do that.

Yes, this is stated in the sentences following that statement ("I-395 traffic accessing Mark Center is required to travel along Seminary Road and execute left turns at the Seminary Road and North Beauregard Street intersection and then access the site via North Beauregard Street and Mark Center Drive intersection. This is required due to the limited weaving distance available between the exit ramp merge point at Seminary Road and the beginning of the left turn lane taper at Mark Center Drive. ")

183. The plan indicates the site can be accessed via the intersection of Beauregard and Mark Center Drive and the intersection of Seminary Road and Mark Center Drive. In fact, the site generally can be accessed only via the intersection of Beauregard and Mark Center Drive. All vehicles coming from northbound and southbound I-395 will be required to use the Beauregard/Mark Center Drive access point.

Trips originating on Seminary Road (for example coming from the east in Alexandria) can, in fact, enter the site via the Seminary Road / Mark Center Drive intersection. The only trips prohibited from using this intersection would be the trips coming from I-395 (NB or SB).

184. Section 4 - What are the definitions of "north" and "south"?

In the context of this statement, "north" applies to areas to the north of the site along I-395 heading towards the Pentagon and "south" applies to areas to the south of the site along I-395 heading towards Springfield.

185. Figure 3-3 (Page 25): Signals and roundabouts usually don't mix well especially when placed right adjacent to one another. Has any analysis been performed to consider roundabout instead of the signal at Mark Center Dr and IDA Dr intersection since a roundabout is being proposed immediately to the south?

Refer to WHS Internal Roadway Network Traffic Analysis Report conducted by Wells & Associates, August 2009.

186. Table 4-16 (Page 82): The TMP states that the operations at the I-395 NB ramps to Seminary Road Exit ramp show an improvement. This contradicts the results in Table 4-11.

The density values remain almost the same with the density values falling within the limits of LOS D and LOS E thresholds {Table 4-11: I-395 NB Ramps Density-34.9 (LOS D) versus Table 4-16: I-395 NB Ramps Density-35.1 (LOS E)}. Refer to Table 4-9 for ramp density threshold values for LOS determination.

Comments related to Traffic Volume

187. The Plan identified "2,022 trips in the morning peak hour and 1,910 trips in the evening peak hours." (pg ES-3 and pg 94). However, Table 2-4, "Trip Projection of BRA 133 Employees with Proposed Mode Split" (pg 18) shows (assuming 90% employees being present) 3,288 single occupant vehicle trips, with another 208 trips for Carpool, Vanpool, and Slug personnel, for a total of 3,496 total.

188. Table 2-4 also shows a total of 3,743 Employee Parking Spaces, of which 3,530 are available for BRAC 133 Employees, leaving 34 (less than 1%) parking spaces available. This means there should be 3,496 vehicle trips in the morning....and a similar number in the evening.

189. It appears the report erroneously took the Table 2-4 Trip Projections as "Round-Trip" rather than "Each Way"resulting in a peak hour flow 50% of actual reality. This miscomputation has significant adverse ramifications.

190. Pg 30 says “...each proposed ID check point will process 350 vehicles per hour, a maximum of 700 vehicles during the highest peak hour demand.” If 90% of traffic arrives during the peak hours of 0600-0900, then 90% of 3,496 equals 3,146, which equates to 1,049/hour. The TMP needs to address how this peak flow will be addressed and how to prevent additional traffic (and safety) issues from traffic queue build-up.

To answer comments #187-#190: The trips identified in Table 4-4 are the number of trips arriving / leaving during the single AM peak hour and during the single PM peak hour whereas the trips identified in Table 2-4 are the total trips entering and leaving the facility across all morning hours (5:00 AM - 10:00 AM) and afternoon/evening hours (2:00 PM – 7:00 PM). Tables 4-2, 4-3 and 4-4 showing peak hour trip calculations have been revised for more clarity.

191. Pg 17 says “Based on the projected mode split employee trips for a typical day (90 percent occupancy), it is estimated that a buffer of 34 additional parking spaces would be available to satisfy unexpected parking demand.” This is less than 1% of the total number of available parking places which is a very marginal buffer. The TMP needs to address how these 34 spaces will be allocated between the North and South garages. It also needs to address the traffic delays associated with people looking for the last one or two spaces in a garage. And finally, it needs to address those times when the buffer is exhausted.....how will this overflow impact the local communities?

192. I agree with Dave Dexter’s comments with the following additions: In reviewing how the available 3747 parking spaces will be allocated, it appears there are 3003 spaces available for SOV that are not otherwise dedicated to a specific type of driver (Set aside spaces for government vehicles – 150, ADA/accessible – 48, vanpool -320, alternate fuel – 192, buffer -34) or, at the most 3243 spaces adding back ADA and alternate fuel spaces. The report states that 3430 “employees” will have parking spots (SOV only?). On page 95 it stated 57% of employees will be provided spaces (?). I did not see any comment about setting aside visitor spaces though understand that consultants will visit the site. I would strongly recommend more clearly elaborating on the number of true SOV spaces available for employee allocation as there seems to be some discrepancy.

To answer comments #191-#192: Table 2-4 has been revised to more clearly present the projected mode splits. Regarding the question about the visitor parking, the 67 visitor spaces are in a separate section of the North Garage and are not available to employees.

193. If the south garage has 1,715 spaces (see page 41) that would represent 45.8% of the 3,747 total available. If the peak hour traffic has 2,022 arriving vehicles (see page ES-3) and 45.8% of them go to the south garage, that is 926 vehicles. Yet, per page 30, that garage can serve "a maximum of 700 vehicles during the highest peak hour of demand".

First, the total number of peak hour trips includes both BRAC 133 trips and IDA trips, with 25 percent of the trips being IDA trips. The S. Parking and N. Parking garages are restricted to BRAC 133 employees only and will not be used by IDA employees. Also, S. Garage spaces will have permanent spaces allotted for government vehicles. Review Section 4 for more information.

194. Numbers seem to be very optimistic in terms of # of people/vehicles processed. For example, in being inspected and entering garage. How many lanes will there be? (700/hr translated into less than 5 sec/vehicle). Also 700/hr does not address the head time for attempted entry when many are trying to report to work at the same time.

This processing rate only applies to the S. Garage which is within the secure perimeter and which will have a manned security checkpoint. Employees entering N. Garage will use a pedestrian walkway to enter the inspection facility before accessing the towers. See Section 3.2.5 for discussion on vehicles entering the S. Garage and processing rates.

195. Is it realistic that 90% of the entire 6,409-person workforce (5,768 people) will commonly be on site at the same time?

196. Over and above days off, vacation, travel, etc., one might hope that a genuine focus on things such as flextime, variable work schedules, working from home and the like would result in a "peak load" that results in considerably more than an estimated 640 personnel being "off site" (or at least off the roadways) at the hours recognized as being the most traffic-sensitive.

To answer comments #195-#196: It is anticipated that the typical day workforce presence at the site will be lesser than 90 percent of the entire workforce. With the implementation of Flexible Work Week, telecommuting, and Compressed Work Week programs it is estimated that the workforce present on the site on a typical day may be much lesser. A 90 percent assumption was made to be conservative in the traffic analysis. The TMP is a living document and will be amended periodically. The transportation coordinator will organize traffic counts and traffic studies over time and the findings of these data collection efforts will be used to identify the effectiveness of the TDM strategies, the average number of SOV trips made to the site on a daily basis, and the average workforce present on a typical day. See Section 5.8.1 for discussion.

197. Page 94 Point 4 "...direct HOV access from I-395 South to Seminary Road...will relieve I-395 congestion..." (the term "relieve" being undefined). That is not my understanding - it might lessen congestion somewhat but this implication would seem to materially overstate expectations.

Relieve is synonymous with lessen. The TMP will be changed to reflect this.

198. Page 22 states that the area is served by an "extensive road system" but failed to mention that it presently provides poor service to the immediate residents during peak hours.

The intent of this statement was not to address current traffic operations. Rather it was to discuss what roadways exist around the site, and there are two major arterials near the site as well as an interstate. The results of the baseline traffic analysis (without the projected BRAC and IDA trips) presented in Section 4 show that several intersections are currently failing.

199. Table 4-19 (Page 86) shows intersections serving as major access points still operating at LOS E with the project added trips and for some cases LOS improving (at the southeast intersection at the rotary). Would this be a reasonable result accounting the addition of project trips? The table clearly shows that although the LOS may be E, all the demand would not be met with close to 700 trips and 400 trips not being serviced at certain intersections during AM and PM peak hour conditions respectively.

Traffic models for future analysis cannot be anticipated to convey all the trips if there is congestion at the upstream intersections or ramp approaches. The future models were developed by refining the existing 2009 models to match site specific conditions. Refer to Section 4.4 and Appendix F. Improvements should be made to improve roadway and intersection operations along the rotary and at Seminary

Road/N. Beauregard Street and N. Beauregard Street / Mark Center Drive to effectively serve vehicle demand at intersection approaches.

200. Table 4-19 (Page 86) shows intersections serving as major access points still operating at LOS E with the project added trips and for some cases LOS improving (at the southeast intersection at the rotary). Would this be a reasonable result accounting the addition of project trips? The table clearly shows that although the LOS may be E, all the demand would not be met with close to 700 trips and 400 trips not being serviced at certain intersections during AM and PM peak hour conditions respectively.

Traffic models for future analysis cannot be anticipated to convey all the trips if there is congestion at the upstream intersections or ramp approaches. The future models were developed by refining the existing 2009 models to match site specific conditions. Refer to Section 4.4 and Appendix F. Improvements should be made to improve roadway and intersection operations along the rotary and at Seminary Road/N. Beauregard Street and N. Beauregard Street / Mark Center Drive to effectively serve vehicle demand at intersection approaches.

Comments related to Assumptions of Roadway Configurations

201. On Page 57, Figure 4-3, the callout for the signal at the intersection of Seminary Road westbound and the ramp from I-395 southbound shows a right-turn-only lane from Seminary Road to the ramp in the wrong direction. Also, the callout for the signal at the intersection of Seminary Road eastbound and the ramp to I-395 southbound shows a right-turn-only lane from the rotary to Seminary Road in the wrong direction. The lane configuration at the intersection of I-395 Northbound and Seminary Road eastbound shows I-395 northbound off ramp having one through and one shared through-right turn lane (as described in Page 56 of the report as delineation of the existing island within the rotary and restriping). The current configuration has the off ramp lane only having one through and one exclusive right turn lane. Since this requires reconfiguration and retiming at the four ramp intersections, this needs to be identified as proposed improvement and noted in figure 4-3 as well. Also, the intersection configuration at North Beauregard St and Seminary Road does not depict the channelized right turn movements. In addition, the lane configurations at the two internal intersections seem is different from the existing conditions. The difference in these assumptions would be critical in interpreting the results from the simulation analysis.

In the TMP this figure has been edited for lane configuration and also shows the proposed roadway improvements along the rotary.

202. Page 68: How many multiple simulation runs were performed for CORSIM in summarizing and averaging the MOEs? Are the electronic files for Synchro and CORSIM available? Would the scenario analyzed with interim improvements include the addition of proposed lanes and signalization as shown in Figure 4-3, or would there be any additional improvement assumed? It is not clear as to what improvements are being proposed versus what is existing since some of the configurations depicted as existing don't coincide with the existing condition. This assumption would be critical in interpreting the results from Table 4-10.
203. Table 4-14 (Page 79): The table shows that the analysis results from the TMP study for 2011 would operate better when compared to that for the existing condition at majority of the intersections, especially at the intersection of I-395 NB off-ramp with Seminary Rd. It appears that

the analysis assumed delineation of the existing island within the rotary and restriping at the rotary of I-395 ramp and Seminary Rd for this TMP analysis. Difference in the assumption of the lane configuration needs to be clearly stated for the purpose of a fair comparison.

Response to comments #202-203: 11 simulation runs were executed for each scenario. Figure 4-3 has been edited to accurately reflect existing lane configurations and to show the rotary improvements that were assumed to be in place for the 2011 projected analysis. The 2011 baseline analysis includes the existing roadway configuration only with optimized signal timing and coordination, and re-distribution of I-395 ramp illegal WB left turns from Seminary Road/Mark Center Drive intersection to Seminary Road/N. Beauregard Street intersection. The 2011 projected analysis includes the interim (DOD) roadway improvements that are currently under construction along with the proposed restriping improvement to show three lanes along the rotary.

Comments related to Visitor Parking

204. Table 4-2 At the 90% employee attendance rate (see page 18), there are 9 visitor vehicles arriving from 5-6 am; 45 from 6-7 am; 67 from 7-8 am; 42 from 8-9 am and 9 from 9-10 am. But there are only 67 visitor spaces to begin with.

205. Table 4-3 A similar question here. 64 visitors depart (from 67 visitor spaces) between 4 and 5 pm. Where then have the 48 that depart between 5 and 6 pm been parking?

To answer comments #204-#205: After discussions with WHS, these tables have been revised to reflect the actual number of visitors expected at the site. Also the tables have been revised to be presented more clearly.

Comments related to Foster Avenue

206. It appears that Foster Avenue is proposed to be converted into a major connector from Beauregard to Seminary. Is that correct? I believe this is the first time the community has been advised of this? Have the residents of Foster been consulted?

- a. In the recommended intersection improvements section of the plan, there are problems with the three improvements related to Foster Avenue:
 - i. "Widen Beauregard to receive four lanes of traffic at Foster Ave." Foster Avenue does not connect to Beauregard.
 - ii. "Widen and improve Foster Ave. to receive two lanes of one-way traffic and provide a merge to Seminary Road." Foster Avenue runs parallel to Seminary Road and therefore a merge is not possible.
 - iii. "Widen Seminary Road at the Foster Ave. merge location." Again, Foster Avenue runs parallel to Seminary Road and a merge is not possible
- b. Also of concern is that the people drafting this plan may not have actually gone to the site---or they would have realized the inaccuracies with Foster Street.

Improvements to Foster were included only as a proposed suggestion for further consideration. This suggested recommendation has Right-of-Way and real estate implications involved as well as drainage

impacts and requires a detailed engineering study. To validate this recommendation the City would have to conduct additional corridor wide traffic analysis along Seminary Road and N. Beauregard Street.

Comments related to Citations

207. Page ES-1 - Where would one find the "guidelines and standards" set forth by the NCPC, GSA and MWCOC?

A link to the guidelines are provided in Section 1.3 (a footnote on pg 3).

208. Page 73: Data source is noted as 2010 HCM. Is this source correct since the 2010 HCM has not been released yet?

Footnote corrected to 2010 HCM Pre-release.

Comments related to Calibration

209. If the year 2011 was defined as baseline condition, how was the CORSIM model calibrated in order for the simulation model to replicate the existing conditions (in terms of volume, speed, and queue etc) to give better representation of the future scenarios evaluated? What was the basis for adjusting different parameters in preparing for the future simulation model?

Document has been revised to include calibration details. The future models were developed by refining the existing 2009 models to match site specific conditions. Refer to Section 4.4 and Appendix F.

Comments related to Previous Studies

210. There have been a variety of studies completed since 2003. The studies are often different in scope and rely on different assumptions. Consequently, they arrive at different conclusions. However, it is generally agreed the proposed off site road improvements currently under construction will not adequately handle the additional site generated traffic and several intersections would operate at unacceptable levels.

The traffic impact analysis results and problem areas included in the TMP concur with this statement.

211. Page 58 - For benefit of our continuing education - why were the Wells and the VHB studies selected to be used as the basis for SAIC's projections?

The Wells & Associates TIMP, the VHB Study developed for the City of Alexandria, and the VDOT IJR were referred to in the TMP as they were used as sources to establish 2011 baseline traffic volumes. Wells' TIMP was the original study developed for the BRAC 133 development. This was compared with the VHB study and VDOT IJR, two standalone traffic reports generated for the government agencies, to obtain existing traffic volumes along I-395 mainline and ramp sections, and intersections.

212. The last paragraph on page 45 states 'The report concludes that with the implementation of the proposed roadway improvements and 10 percent TMP trip reduction, all study (studied) intersections will operate at an acceptable LOS under full build-out and occupancy conditions' And what happens if it does not work? Is there a Plan B?

This is just a summary of a prior study, the Mark Center Parcel 1A and 1B Traffic Impact Study and Transportation Management Plan conducted by a 2003 Wells & Associates Study. This is not a finding from the TMP.

213. The most recent Alternatives are not included on page 51. This needs to be updated to include the three new possibly Alternatives. Pg. 51

This is just a summary of the 2009 study. VDOT is in the process of evaluating additional alternatives and no alternative has been finalized yet (page 92).

SECURITY-RELATED COMMENTS

There were a number of comments related to issues that cannot be addressed publicly due to the sensitive nature of the information. Due to security reasons, details on the topics below were not included in the TMP.

1. Have evacuation plans been made to address any possible emergency, attack or "event"?
2. If there are "problems" in the RIF, what procedures are to be followed?
3. Would they assist local law enforcement in determining if a vehicle belonged to a BRAC employee?
4. For sake of information (and to address the peace of mind of local residents) does a vehicle that "fail(s) the scan" at the RIF get nothing more than an "escort to exit the site"?
5. What are the combined numbers for the number of BRAC-133 employees from the King St. Metro and VRE at King St.? Pg. 39, Pg. 40
6. What proportion of the BRAC 133 employees will be civilians versus military personnel and how effective could the TMP be enforced and implemented?

COMMENTS OUTSIDE THE DOMAIN OF A TMP

There were a number of comments received that relate to topics that are outside the domain of a TMP. These comments are provided here for reference but information on these comments is not included in the TMP.

1. What department is responsible for the “facilities maintenance staff” that will maintain the cleanliness and preservation of the Transportation Center? Pg. 100
2. Where will the VRE riders exit the train? Will this require additional shuttle buses? Pg. 14, Pg. 17
3. What is the ‘outdoor’ environmental quality standard? AC generator noise, transportation noise, water use (flushing of toilets, cafeteria use, showers etc.), sewer needs? Can the current infrastructure handle the volume? Pg. 19
4. What would the impact of private bus companies transporting BRAC-133 employees have on the local neighborhood traffic? Pg. 36
5. Who pays for trash pickup at the Transportation Center? Does the City of Alexandria have the funds to handle the new volume of trash that will be created by 6,400 plus employees? It appears at the current time we do not have enough funds to cover our current needs.
6. WHS should conduct an annual survey of the neighborhood residents surrounding the BRAC-133 site along with their survey of employees. The results should be given to the BRAC Advisory Committee. Pg. 119
7. Pg 26 says “Every visitor will be required to register in advance and receive approval from PFFA, at least one day prior to visiting the site.” As someone who has had multiple tours at the Pentagon, I can assure you issues pop-up without giving that lead-time specified. The TMP needs to address adverse impact to the mission of personnel being unable to attend a meeting or give necessary input due to this administrative limitation.
8. Has it been pointed out that the projected peak AM and PM hours are nearly identical to the start of the school day at the schools on Seminary Rd., King St. and Braddock Rd.? Has a safety evaluation been done to assess the impact on student safety? Pg. 61
9. The proposal to shift or add a stop for existing bus routes at the Mark Center would likely add time to the route. I would like the report to make a comment about projected trip duration impacts so that local residents are fully aware of a potential impact in their commute.
10. Alluded to, but not clearly stated, is likelihood that the north and south I-395 exists on either side of Seminary Rd (King St and Duke St/Little River Turnpike) will also be impacted by non-shuttle traffic trying to avoid the more congested Seminary intersection. Is there any way to evaluate how these intersections are impacted by BRAC-133 in the designated reporting intervals?
11. Buses, van pools, shuttles, bikes, pedestrians are all caught in AM/PM peak traffic congested road network. The TMP fails to provide a plan to addressing the overriding issue; traffic congestion related to WHS-BRAC 133.
12. DoD shuttle buses for employees are proposed to be operating at 10 or 15 minute headways to and from Metro Stations during the AM/PM peak periods. The TMP should consider impacts on traffic near and in the metro station bus terminal area to ensure the shuttle buses are not adding to congestion and that employees can reasonably expect on time service.
13. Residents have also expressed concern regarding impacts on fire and emergency medical service.

14. Given 1.1, it is difficult to know how much to say, question, ask. To the extent the public may not understand some of the methodology or conclusions, how much of an education are we due?
15. ES-3 - Will the commuting needs of personnel at IDA and CNA and/or others in the vicinity be considered in any manner?
16. I did not see information in this report which focused on any other than the AM or PM peak hour. Hell, we all know that the traffic stinks in this area for way longer than an hour. Why does this report not address that point? When I did the EIS for the relocation of all Naval Systems Command staff from Crystal City to one of five sites (including Mark Center) back in 1990, we specifically addressed the duration during which TMP efforts might mitigate those impacts. [By the way, we concluded what the City, the Army, and all their consultants failed to conclude this time – that there was no way in hell that Mark Center offered a reasonable location to place DOD personnel, due to the lack of a Metro station.]
17. Has money been identified for these buses?
18. There is a time lag between identifying a need and providing the resource. Has this timeframe been determined and planned for?
19. There is time required to integrate these buses into existing bus routes and adjust bus-stop schedules accordingly. Has this been considered and integrated into the plan?
20. Has the environmental (both pollution and traffic) impact of these additional buses been considered?
21. Has the scheduled usage of these buses at the Mark Center Transportation Center been considered and integrated into the overall schedule?
22. If the above have been considered...it needs to be made visible to the public. If it has not been studied and considered, it needs to be.
23. The traffic impact analysis section of the plan cites several studies that have been conducted between 2003 and the present. Unfortunately, there is no solid comparative analysis of the studies nor is there any attempt to reconcile the major differences that exist between them.
24. What was the traffic count for Seminary Rd from Quaker Lane west to N. Beauregard in the TIS/TMP study, March 31, 2003? Pg. 45
25. Because the PB, April, 2009 study stated in the TIMP that the road improvements identified would not be adequate to handle the additional site generated traffic, what is proposed for the network of roads serving the BRAC-133 site? Are there plans to widen King St., Braddock Rd or Seminary Rd. from Quaker Lane to Kenmore Ave.? Pg. 49
26. The delay in construction and funding for road and transit improvements should be taken into consideration in the Transportation Management Plan.
27. Who is paying for what [emergency services]?
28. Has responsibility for the provision of emergency services been resolved?
29. The plan should also include potential projects that would qualify for funding through the Defense Access Road program
30. Page 35: Has the need for modifying the transit routes been considered for Fairfax Connector? How would the new routes be funded and how will buses get to the transit center?

31. The TMP only provides an analysis for 2011 conditions (baseline + projected Mark Center/IDA) and lacks a longer term planning analysis. Assessing only opening year conditions seems short-sighted and does not account for significant future traffic issues post-BRAC 133.
32. On Page 90, Section 4.4.9 offers several roadway and intersection improvements to address impacts of the baseline and projected volumes. There is no discussion, however, of how to fund these improvements and what would happen if most or all could not be implemented.

COMMENTS THAT ARE NOT ACTIONABLE

There were a number of comments received that were not actionable. These comments are provided here for reference.

1. The impact of BRAC 133 will extend far beyond the immediate intersections next to the Mark Center (pg ES-3). There will be additional traffic coming from the West (from Columbia Pike and Route 7...as well as Seminary Road and George Mason) as well as from the South (people exiting I-395 at Rt 235, or coming north on Van Dorn to cut over at Sanger Blvd to Beauregard) and from the East (from Maryland exiting Telegraph road to Rt 236, then North on Quaker Lane to Seminary Road West). These are just some examples of the regional impact BRAC 133 will have. The broader regional impact on traffic patterns should be studied and addressed.
2. The proposed Transportation Plan should directly address the traffic congestion issue. The increased impacts and cost on the City of Alexandria taxpayers and nearby residents should be borne by the Department of Defense. The DoD should place a high priority on safe, efficient transportation of their employees to the WHS-BRAC-133 Office Complex at Mark Center with no adverse impacts on existing levels of traffic and transit service, or environmental quality.
3. Pg 73 (and Tables 4-12 and 4-13) show many intersections and lane group movements operating at an unacceptable LOS currently. This will only get worse with the severe stress caused by BRAC 133. Pg 85 says "...These degrading operations at the individual intersection approaches will eventually lead to the failure of the overall intersection. In addition, the overall intersection at the Seminary Road and North Beauregard Street intersection operated at unacceptable levels under the projected morning and evening peak hour demands, with all the intersection approaches and lane group movements experiencing severed delay. ..." Since the BRAC improvements for traffic flow are minimal compared to the increase in traffic flow....catastrophic traffic impact is almost a certainty. The regional impact of this traffic must be considered.
4. I am very concerned about the statement on page 74 "These degrading operations at the individual approaches will eventually lead to the failure of the overall intersection." Pg. 74, Pg. 85
5. Additional car-sharing vehicles should not be allowed. This would negate the push to lower SOV. This would be counter to the TMP goals of reducing single occupancy cars on the roadway network. Pg. 114
6. Variable work hours/flex time/telecommuting needs to be strongly encouraged. This could be a great benefit to reducing the Peak time congestion. PG. 11
7. Third, to the extent the final Plan may consider recommending widening of any streets in the vicinity (beyond the essential "triple-turn" project now under way), it must be recognized that this too will not provide a solution or solutions that can be implemented before the facility opens.
8. The goal to establish a TMP office is not a goal at all. It is a statement of what must be done, but if the goals of a TMP are that soft (and unrelated to the outcome of traffic and trip levels and characteristics), then it really isn't a TMP at all.
9. Fails to adequately consider the impact of BRAC-133 on the regional and local transportation network and provide realistic solutions that can be implemented in the near and intermediate time periods.
10. Fails to address the full transportation impacts of 6409 employees occupying the building in September 2011. Some of these impacts not only have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of

people living in the area, but also result in taxpayers of Alexandria absorbing costs associated with street and road improvements, increased transit service, fire and emergency medical services, and costs associated with DoD shuttle service at metro stations.

11. The Special Events Protocol requiring visitors attending a conference, training seminar, organized large meeting or other special events to board a DoD shuttle bus from designated Metrorail pick-up points will be difficult to implement.
12. There is no reason the City of Alexandria or the local community can rely on trusting the DoD leadership to address concerns outside the area of the WHS-BRAC at Mark Center. The program is essentially voluntary. ("A monitoring and effectiveness plan will help the Transportation Coordinator to evaluate the effectiveness of the various transportation programs and strategies under the BRAC-133", ES-4)
13. I am suggesting that 'southbound' traffic on I-395 be encouraged to exit at King St. east to left at N. Beauregard. This would eliminate many left turns from Seminary Rd. onto N. Beauregard.
14. A recent I-95/I-395 Transit/Transportation Demand Management Study, April 2010 concludes: "The future Seminary Road/Mark Center Transit Center is projected to attract heavy ridership, both as an origin/destination and as a transfer point to the Pentagon". The report recommends a need for two additional BRT Bays, in addition to local and express bays.
15. While the TMP for the previous site was "approved" in 2003:
 - a. It was acknowledged to be incomplete;
 - b. It required that personnel pay market rates for parking;
 - c. The direct I-395 access was later waived with no commensurate reduction in the gross square footage permitted to be developed (a question for the City, rather than DOD, to answer).
16. It would be helpful to have further elaboration about the assignment of parking spaces. Apparently there will be no more than one permit per space (page 105) and it "...will be numbered, corresponding to a single employee's registered vehicle..." (page 106).
17. Contrary to the statement made on page 117, it is highly unlikely that many of the employees would walk to the site. With the exception of apartments at Southern Towers, it is unlikely there are many employees living within a twenty minute walk of WHS-BRAC-133 at Mark Center. The Transportation Management Plan states: "Over 500 employees live within three miles of BRAC 133, over 400 employees within two miles and over 100 employees in less than one mile." It is highly unlikely that many would walk to the site because of:
 - a. Few residents live within walking distance of the complex,
 - b. Streets in the nearby neighborhoods are not on a normal street grid pattern, requiring pedestrians to take a more the circuitous route to the complex.
 - c. Sidewalks are too narrow; and
 - d. Wide streets, traffic and turning movements discourage pedestrian use in the immediate area of Seminary and Beauregard.
 - e. During inclement weather neither biking nor walking are attractive options.
18. The community is concerned regarding the addition of 3,800 new vehicle trips and many more if you add shuttles and buses.
19. Nearby residents are dissatisfied that appropriate measures are being taken to ensure employees and contractors will not be parking in neighborhood areas.
20. Proposals for bikes, walkway and paths, safe pedestrian crossings give a false impression. This is not a pedestrian-bike friendly area.

21. Residents remain skeptical the Transportation Management Plan will effectively mitigate traffic and transit impacts.
22. Other options for realigning the interchange or providing direct access to the WHS-BRAC Complex at Mark Center are dependent on approval of design and funding, and any solution is far into the future.
23. As outlined on page 94, most of the roadway improvement, including the Seminary Road exit ramps from I-395 north and south will continue to operate at unacceptable levels. High Occupancy Vehicle access to Seminary Road from I-395 and other short and long term improvements are being studied, and funding for any of the projects is uncertain.
24. It is interesting to note that "over 45 per cent of employees use some form of transit today", but two thirds of those use Metrorail for at least part of their trip - presumably on their final leg going to their office - and now none of those 1,956 people (30.53% Metrorail users of 6,409 total personnel) will have that option..
25. "...with 10 percent to 30 percent of employees riding Metrorail today, it is implicit that employees are accustomed to transit." Per page 11, 30.53% currently use Metro. One assumes convenience is a/the primary factor, given that most relocating personnel currently work at locations adjacent to Metrorail stations. Whatever their motivation, it will no longer be an option (at least as their final leg to reach their office)
26. 5.1.4. With respect to "character" I don't believe the City ever contemplated a major terrorist target, complete with a RIF.
27. 5.9.1. From my personal (layman's) perspective, the ridematching software referenced on page 111 could be a major key to successfully doing this.
28. 6.1. General Comment: To the extent that it is our tax dollars which have been used to pay for the bulk of the recent traffic studies, it is extremely disconcerting to see that the TMP lists no fewer than 12 of them with Benham's/SAIC's now representing number 13!
29. 6.5.2. While a major desire is to promote use of HOVs, the HOV lanes of I-395 don't offer the possibility of "accessing" the Seminary Road interchange.
30. 6.8.1. One is left with the very real sense that there are simply no materially significant traffic mitigation measures which can be implemented anytime in the foreseeable future. The question then becomes "What do we do?" Will we be compelled to live with "failure", "severe delay", multi-mile "spillbacks" impacting multiple interchanges? Will we be forced to accept the "unacceptable E or F" levels of service? What are our options? Have we any?
31. Point 3 "These improvements (as proposed in the TMP) if approved and implemented will alleviate traffic congestion and promote smooth travel." The term "alleviate" is undefined but the implied conclusion does not seem to align with earlier assertions about insolvable "failures" and anything but "smooth travel".
32. "Purchasing a licensing agreement to ridematching software and/or online applications..." (Or developing WHS'/DOD's own software?) To me, this is the best course of action with respect to addressing personnel needs and attempting to respond to them. Travel patterns are very personalized and options clearly extend far beyond printed transportation schedules, etc. The best option for any individual may well be just around the block or down the street. WHS needs to facilitate not only "matching" personnel having similar needs but to work, virtually individual by

individual, to see what "tweaks" can be made, services added, schedules altered, etc. in order to convert "doesn't meet my needs" to "I can do that".

33. I was not all that pleased with the document. On the one hand, there are things which are mentioned which I believe hold real promise for decreasing the impacts of BRAC 133, such as the significant DOD shuttle program from a variety of Metrorail stations. But the TMP does not (unless I missed it) really get into what needs to be done to make sure that WHS staff actually use these shuttles. I do not want to be paying federal taxes for such shuttles if they are not highly subscribed and if they do not significantly mitigate the traffic impacts of BRAC 133.
34. I am troubled by the lack of clear definition on p. ES-2 where the mode splits are listed as "anticipated." Are these anticipated with the TMP in full implementation? at opening day of BRAC 133? Or are these the baseline without the TMP in place? Here is what the TMP needs to state, something like this:
35. If BRAC is implemented and nothing else is done, here are the anticipated mode shares, and the traffic impacts of same. Here is a plan to make those impacts less, and achieve the goals. If the plan is implemented, then the resultant, improved mode shares would be as follows and they do or do not meet the goals set for this project.
36. The extent of the projected congestion is extremely concerning:
37. "...many of the lane group movements and intersection approaches operate at unacceptable LOS for the 2011 baseline condition. These degrading operations at the individual approaches will eventually lead to the failure of the overall intersection(s)."
38. "...without BRAC improvements..." (that term appearing to be generally undefined) "Some of the I-395 mainline and ramp sections (are already)...operating at unacceptable LOS."
39. "...all the (Seminary/Beauregard) intersection approaches and lane group movements experiencing severe delay."
40. "...locations of concern throughout the study area...long traffic queues and spillovers...unacceptable E or F, with demand exceeding capacity."
41. "...spillover along southbound I-395 extends north past the King Street interchange..." with the implication that the Duke Street interchange will experience the same thing.
42. Unfortunately the TMP does not appear to include any assessment of anticipated traffic conditions after the "solutions" (a term used in the Section 4.4.9 heading but which one might logically fear is a rather gross overstatement) are implemented. It is further noted that some of the proposed mitigation measures are "long-term" and will require "extensive coordination".
43. The SOV trip reductions rely mainly on the fact that there are only 3,747 employee and visitor parking spaces for 6,409 employees. However, I don't think they did enough analysis on parking near the facility. People will find parking where you least expect. There is a shopping center near the facility where employees will try to park.
44. This draft report, as presented on the City website, was illegible (particularly all the info presented in the tables, diagrams, etc). Thus I am not sure that some of my concerns might not have been addressed (but I doubt that they were). I was told by the Corps of Engineers that all community comments (via the City website) were to be transmitted by the City to the Corps by COB Friday June 18. (The website, however, posted an earlier cutoff for comments.) Due to the quality of the

document and my limited visual capability, it has taken me until now to get through this draft. *I am presuming that you will honor the June 18 cutoff for my remarks.*

45. I am suggesting that the move of 27 organizations to BRAC-133 be done in phases over a yearlong period of time. This would allow evaluation of road improvements, pedestrian walkways, signage and transit plans. Adjustments could be made as organizations moved into the buildings. This seems like the only sensible way to avoid a complete breakdown of the roadways surrounding Mark Center.
46. It is disappointing to note that WHS employees were apparently surveyed about their concerns but without having had any briefing and with their specifically noting a "lack of information". Are they not the key source of "input data" in addressing future transportation needs?
47. The visitors/meetings/conferences situation does not sound well thought out, either qualitatively or quantitatively. I think this will be a mess, especially if there are many frequent, or large meetings on site (which you already suggest will happen). Perhaps more so for meetings that do not span the day. Also for meetings which are not scheduled early enough to attempt a 24-hr advance parking (application) spot. And "park and ride" spaces at Metro stops are generally not available after early AM hours.
48. It is likely meetings and conferences will generate additional traffic and demand for parking in nearby neighborhoods.
49. Given the current state of traffic on I-395 and the expectation that it will only get worse, some would suggest that I-395 is one of their least attractive options and may well not be the route chosen by "most" commuters.
50. As but one example - I would assume that there are lengthy lead times in ordering, or even leasing, things like shuttle busses (and, if needed, more DASH busses).
51. And what might that infer about future traffic (westbound on Seminary) choosing to enter Southern Towers only to make a u-turn in order to access Mark Center?
52. ES-3. When personnel are presented with so many roadway options/alternatives how does one meaningfully distribute "generated trips...along the existing roadway network...as per the home zip code distribution"?
53. There was also the scenario of improving outside accessibility (walkways) for the disabled community. It was not clear what the geographical/topographical extent of these modifications are planned, so I cannot begin to comment on this point.
54. The TMP has something about service from the King metro station and it is only a 7 minute trip from our metro station to King metro station so people would not even concern using a shuttle from our station because it would be quicker for them to just get off on King street and they would actually be using the metro station instead of just parking there.
55. There is no guarantee that carpools and vanpools would be formed as anticipated although the zip code of employee origin may be identical. Also there are limitations in number of potential sluggers since no direct HOV access is provided to the site where the majority of the employee would be coming from during the peak direction (from I-395 NB to the site during AM and to I-395 SB from the site during PM).
56. Table 4-20 (Page 88) although the results show acceptable LOS, the trips being served are not all of the anticipated project demand trips.

57. Figure 3-8 (Page 41): Preliminary shuttle routes have limitation of capturing much of the employees coming from the south. Shuttle to and from the King Street Station would be critical in capturing Metrorail and VRE commuters from the south. Also depending on the origin of the employees, the shuttle serving the VRE Crystal City station would also need to be considered. One challenge in providing the shuttle service is avoiding the congested routes along with being on schedule for trips that are transferring from different modes.

CITY OF ALEXANDRIA COMMENTS

General Comments

1. The US Army did not include many of the transit improvements and TDM strategies recommended by City of Alexandria staff.

USACE/WHs included transit improvements that were deemed the most feasible and cost-efficient in the short term (see Section 3.3.2, Table 3-2). However, due to recent discussions with the City of Alexandria and the Ad Hoc BRAC Committee, many of the improvements in Section 3.3.2, Table 3-2 are currently being planned. The final TMP will be changed to include the improvements currently being planned.

The only TDM strategy not included is parking pricing.

WHs will continue discussions with DASH and WMATA concerning possible route enhancements to support BRAC-133.

2. There are several elements of the TMP which are not as complete as they should be. For example, the section on proposed shuttle routes is preliminary. While City staff understands the shuttle bus plan will need to be revised periodically, a final draft plan should have been included in the TMP.

The shuttle plan details were not included in the draft TMP due to City and Fairfax County staff requests to discuss the feasibility of service to Van Dorn and Franconia-Springfield Metro Stations.

The shuttle plan will be included in the final version of the TMP. The details that will be included are:

- System Service Capacity
- Number of Buses
- Headways
- Routes and Shuttle Destinations (including a Franconia/Springfield Route)
- Estimated Passengers

3. The TMP does not provide adequate information to feel confident that the proposed TMP will result in 40% reduction in single occupancy vehicle trips.

Upon discussion with the City, it was determined that lack of confidence in the TMP rested predominantly on the lack of inclusion of the final shuttle plan and transit improvements.

As the final shuttle plan will be included in the final TMP, as well as some of the agreed upon transit improvements being worked out with the Ad Hoc Committee and the City, USACE/WHs believe these additions will enhance confidence in the TMP.

USACE/WHs are confident in the abilities of WHs to meet the goals of the TMP due to the DoD shuttle system which will provide robust service with capacity for 40% of the building population, combined with the limited parking availability, and the TDM strategies to be implemented.

4. The TMP will need to be revised if the appropriations bill including the language added by Representative Moran is approved. The language limits the number of parking spaces that could initially be used to 1,000.

The final TMP will not include language or strategies to address the proposed legislation as it defines a specific set of conditions including 3,747 parking spaces.

The Army will include language in the transmittal forwarding the TMP that if legislation is passed an interim TMP must and will be developed and that the final TMP will be set aside until the full number of parking spaces is restored.

5. The BRAC TDM does not provide any indication of how people who are not counted in the 6,500 count will get to work. Does this count include contractors? Are people who do building maintenance, food service, or other functions included? If not, how will these people get there? Since these people may not be coming at peak times, we have to figure out how they will get there in order to minimize parking disruptions in neighbor communities. Will these people be able to use DoD shuttles or have the opportunity to obtain a parking permit? Good public transit options for these additional numbers are needed.

Thirty-one per cent of the building population of 6,409 represents contractor staff; these staff have been included in the analyses presented in the TMP.

In addition to the 6,409 professional staff, there will be 150 other federal and non-federal employees at BRAC-133 providing a range of support functions, including security, IT, building management, and other service functions.

Each tenant organization is responsible for their non-federal employees, and all non-federal employees will be expected to follow the same protocol as federal employees. The TMP strategies will also apply to these employees. Each tenant organization will determine whether their contract employees will be eligible for parking permits. These employees will be able to utilize the DoD shuttle, as the system has sufficient capacity to support these employees, even in the off-peak.

A description clarifying the aforementioned description will be provided in the final TMP.

Tables and figures will be adjusted to include a discussion of the additional 150 support personnel.

Mode Splits

6. 23% Metro assumption is higher than the assumption used in other studies. The BRAC building is not within walking distance of any Metro Station. City staff believes that the 23% Metro use will not be achieved.

The TMP does not assume 23% Metrorail ridership – it assumes 23% rail transit ridership (including VRE).

It should be noted that prior studies assumed 20% Metrorail ridership, so the TMP projects a number which is only 3% higher than previous studies. The key reason for this higher assumption is the extensive shuttle system which will provide capacity for transporting up to 40% of the building population between the building and mass transit centers during peak periods. Prior studies were not aware of the details of the shuttle plan. This extensive shuttle system supports higher rail ridership. In fact, 23% is believed to be conservative given the shuttle system and the current commuting patterns of employees.

Upon discussions with the City, a major driver behind their assumption that 23% is too high is that studies have indicated that the further a worksite is from rail transit, the lower rail ridership is. However, those studies do not account for extensive connection services (like the DoD shuttle) that provide a link from distant rail transit to the worksite. Again, as the shuttle system will be able to serve 40% of the building population from both Metrorail and VRE, we believe that rail ridership will at a minimum be 23%.

7. The 5% bus transit assumption may not be achievable. The bus transit percentage was estimated assuming that routes providing service within one mile of the BRAC building could be considered as providing transit service to the site. One mile is not the proper standard. One-quarter mile or at most one-half mile should have been used for estimating bus transit usage. Most transit related studies show that 1000 feet (.19 miles) to 2000 feet (.38 miles) is an average distance people are willing to walk to a bus stop. Within the TMP under Pedestrian Access & Facilities, page 27, it states, "the existing pedestrian walkway system adjacent to the Mark Center site is in a poor condition with substandard effective sidewalk widths (4 feet or less) and pavement conditions, discouraging

pedestrian mode of travel and posing a threat to pedestrian safety, especially to the disabled pedestrians." With such pedestrian conditions in getting to the site, it would be difficult to assume the 5%.

The TMP only considered service that serves within ½ mile of BRAC-133. The reason for this confusion lies in Figure 3-5 which displays existing bus routes within 1 mile of the BRAC-133 facility. The final version of the TMP will be modified to only reflect those routes within ½ mile of the site.

Regarding assumptions about how far commuters will be willing to walk to a bus stop, many studies, including studies from MWCOG show that commuters are willing to walk up to 1 mile, so the assumption that employees would walk less than a ½ mile is a reasonable. Current bus stops on Beauregard and Mark Center Drive, as well as those at Southern Towers, are less than 2000 feet from the BRAC 133 building.

The Army and the City of Alexandria, continue to discuss implementation of Table 3-2 improvements to bring public transit to the transportation center. The final TMP will be adjusted to include all transit improvements agreed to, which will lessen the walking distance for pedestrians.

Regarding the pedestrian walkway system on page 27, note that the paragraph that follows these statements describes the proposed sidewalk and pedestrian circulation improvement plan that is being implemented by DoD as part of the off-site roadway improvements, which will improve the conditions of the current walkways (see Figure 3-4).

8. Explain the percentage of those using VRE and the percentage of those using Metrorail to assist in understanding where additional transit links/resources would be helpful.

Currently only 3% of employees use VRE and 9% use Metrorail as their primary mode of transportation. An additional 3.5% use VRE and 21% use Metrorail on occasion, or in combination with other modes of transportation, as shown in Table 2-3.

9. On page 14, there is a table showing the anticipated mode split based on employee surveys. The anticipated percentages in this table are very different than the anticipated mode splits found on pages ES-2, 13, 17, and 18. Why such a variance / how was the survey on page 14 factored into the mode splits found on ES-2, 13, 17, and 18?

The word “anticipated” was incorrectly used in the Executive Summary and will be corrected in the final version. The intention throughout the document was to use the term “anticipated” to refer to the survey results, thereby reflecting what employees thought they would do in the future at the new building. The term “projected” was to refer to the projected actual mode split. As discussed in Section 2.3, the projected mode split (shown in pages ES-2, 13, 17, and 18) was determined based on a variety of factors, only one of which is the “anticipated” mode split that employees indicated on the survey. Employee perceptions of expected mode split are not believed to be entirely accurate as many employees were not yet familiar with all modes of access to the site when responding to that early survey. Other inputs used to develop mode split and trip generation were as follows:

- Employee origin zip codes
- Modes based on what was viable or feasible for employees based on where they live
- Regional commute patterns from various sources
- Current mode use of employees and anticipated mode use in the future (WHS 2009 employee survey)
- Sense of how “open” employees were to alternate modes of travel (WHS 2009 employee survey comments)
- Insight into which bus routes and rail lines employees use (WHS 2009 employee survey)

10. How does the general commute pattern as referred to in the Executive Summary compare with the surveyed commute pattern of WHS shown in Table 2-3?

The statement in the Executive Summary indicating that the mode split was compared against general commute patterns in the region is perhaps too strong. The intent of this statement was to explain that commute patterns in the region were used to help inform the assumptions of mode split.

The Executive Summary will be revised to clarify this point.

Transit

11. The TMP states that 45% of employees use some form of transit. The large proportion of transit users is primarily related to the proximity of their place of work to Metro stations. Since BRAC is not near a Metro station, the percentage of transit users will be significantly lower.

The TMP incorrectly states 45% - this number will be changed to “over 58%” to correctly reflect the survey data. Please note that this statistic illustrates the number of employees who **currently** use either Metrorail, VRE, or bus transit for some part of their commute, not necessarily as their primary mode or on a regular basis. This statistic was determined by adding the Metrorail (30.53%), VRE (6.65%), and Bus (21.29%) mode utilization rates in Table 2-1.

Specifics indicating that the 58% is a combination of transit modes will be included in the final TMP.

Note that in contrast to the 58% survey results, the mode split as projected for the Mark Center facility is only 28% (23% rail transit/5% local bus transit) as illustrated in Table 2-4.

12. The discussion of local bus transit needs to be more comprehensive.

We believe that the transit discussion meets the needs of the TMP since the 5% projected ridership should be able to be accommodated via existing local transit service.

Recent discussions between the Army and the City of Alexandria are intended to implement the recommendations contained in Table 3-2. The final TMP will be adjusted to include all transit improvements agreed to, which will lessen the walking distance for pedestrians.

WHS will continue discussions with DASH and WMATA concerning possible route enhancements to support BRAC-133.

13. The nearest bus stop for DASH AT1 and AT2 needs to be identified in the section on DASH service.

Adjustments will be made to the final TMP to show the nearest bus stops. The AT1 and AT2 routes serve Mark Center with a stop along N. Beauregard Street near the intersection of Mark Center Drive. The bus stop on the southbound side of the N. Beauregard and Mark Center Drive intersection is 0.29 miles from BRAC-133 while the bus stop on the northbound side of the N. Beauregard and Mark Center intersection is 0.25 miles from BRAC-133. The other nearby stop is at Southern Towers which is 0.26 miles from BRAC-133.

14. The description of Metrobus service seems to indicate that they are providing direct service to the Mark Center. They are not now, and would require additional subsidy to make local bus service viable. The exact location of the bus stops needs to be clarified.

The locations of these bus stops will be clarified in the final TMP. Metrobus routes 7A and 7F provide service to Mark Center at a stop on Mark Center Drive near the intersection of Mark Center Drive and Seminary Rd, which is less than 2000 feet from the BRAC 133 towers. Metrobus route 7X (as well as 7A and 7F) also provide direct service to Mark Center with a stop along N. Beauregard Street near the intersection of Mark Center Drive. The bus stop on the southbound side of the N. Beauregard and Mark Center Drive intersection is 0.29 miles from BRAC-133 while the bus stop on the northbound side of the N. Beauregard and Mark Center intersection is 0.25 miles from BRAC-133. Other Metrobus routes (all 7's, 25B, 28A, 28G) serve Southern Towers, which although not directly at Mark Center, is 0.26 miles from BRAC-133.

15. Southern Towers does not equal Mark Center. Under the local transit section, please change the language from "serve Mark Center" to something along the lines as "stops near Mark Center", etc. The only public transit routes that 'serve Mark Center' are WMATA's 7A & 7F routes.

Adjustment will be made to the final TMP to accommodate the suggested language.

16. Fix Figure 3.5 to add missing bus routes. WMATA service needs to be updated to reflect correct current routes.

Adjustment will be made to the final TMP to accommodate these routes.

The transit routes will be verified with the City of Alexandria before inclusion into the final TMP.

17. Discussion in 3.3.2 about using public transit services to serve BRAC is encouraging.

Thank you.

18. How do they address whether a transit route is diverted into BRAC? How do they address potentially turning deadhead trips into live trips?

The TMP assumes that the 5% projected ridership can be accommodated via existing local transit service without any changes.

USACE/WHs are currently in discussions with the City of Alexandria to plan for modifications to routes in the vicinity of the Mark Center to include the new Transportation center, including the conversion of current deadhead trips into revenue trips. Actual details of route changes and procedures will be the responsibility of transit agencies to coordinate.

WHs will continue discussions with DASH and WMATA concerning possible route enhancements.

19. Will WMATA and DASH buses be extended to BRAC?

USACE/WHs are currently in discussions with the City of Alexandria and the Ad Hoc BRAC Committee to plan for the route diversions to the transportation center and the reversal of deadhead trips.

20. Map on page A-5 showing bus systems and routes within 1 mile of BRAC-13 facility is incorrect.

The map was created based on GIS data files provided by both WMATA and the City.

Adjustments will be made to show correct routes. The transit routes will be verified with the City of Alexandria before inclusion into the final TMP.

21. All of the transit improvements included in Table 3.2 should be included as part of this TMP plan.

The possible transit improvements listed in Table 3-2 are dependent on WMATA and jurisdictional action; so the TMP cannot rely on all of these potential improvements. The TMP primarily relies on the robust DoD shuttle system as described in Section 3.5.2 that provides frequent service to a number of Metrorail stations.

Recent discussions between the Army and the City of Alexandria are intended to implement the recommendations contained in Table 3-2. The final TMP will be adjusted to include all transit improvements agreed to. WHs will continue discussions with DASH and WMATA concerning possible route enhancements.

22. The transit program should include:

- a. Provide a transit store at the Mark Center Transportation Center

Currently there is no planned space for a permanent transit store at the Transportation Center. There will be a mobile commuter store present at the facility twice a week (and more often during the first three months of the building being open). The provision of a transit store is a long-term strategy that can be implemented if sufficient demand is demonstrated as stated in Section 5.5.4.

- b. Provide funding to DASH and WMATA to increase the frequency of bus routes from King Street and Van Dorn Metro station.

DoD is evaluating the potential for local and regional service providers to provide part or all of the DoD Mark Center shuttle service. Decisions will be based on efficiency and cost effectiveness. As the result of previous discussion with the City, Van Dorn is not being considered as a shuttle destination. The existing frequency of the Van Dorn Metro Station DASH routes are considered adequate for the projected demand.

- c. Provide funding to WMATA and DASH to make modifications to existing routes that currently serve the area within one mile of BRAC-133 to serve the Transportation Center.

Recent discussions between the Army and the City of Alexandria are intended to implement the recommendations contained in Table 3-2. The final TMP will be adjusted to include all transit improvements agreed to. WHS will continue discussions with DASH and WMATA concerning possible route enhancements. Decisions will be made based on whether efficiency and effectiveness gains can be achieved.

- d. Expand the Mark Center Transportation Center to include additional bus bays to accommodate the enhancements listed above.

As discussed in Section 5.5.4, expanding the Transportation Center is something that will be considered in the future if needed. The capacity of the bus bays are sufficient as according to TCRP Report 100: Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual. The current five bus bays also have excess capacity to support additional service.

- 23. On page 29, it shows a bus stop on Mark Center Drive (south - closer to IDA). Transit is unaware of a bus stop being installed at this location. Is this a private bus stop to be used by IDA shuttles? A bus stop at this location does not make too much sense as buses coming from that direction will access the transit center, which is just a few feet to the north/east of the shown stop. Also, there is an existing bus stop on westbound Mark Center Drive at Highview Lane.

There are currently no plans for this to be a bus stop. The bus stop location will be removed from the figure in the final TMP.

- 24. There is only one bus stop across the street from the Transit Center, not two as stated in the TMP.

There is enough space for two buses to queue, but as it is currently approved by the City, these will be curb-side stops. Adjustment will be made to clarify this in the final TMP.

- 25. Page 38, will Duke & IDA continue to run shuttles after BRAC 133 opens? If so, will these shuttles use bus bays within the transit center?

Yes, Duke and IDA currently plan to continue their shuttles after BRAC 133 opens. However, these shuttles will not utilize the Transportation Center.

- 26. The TMP should include something on paratransit services available for employees and visitors with disabilities.

Paratransit services are available to employees and visitors through WMATA and DASH. The final TMP will include a reference to this available service.

27. Include something on average commute times via transit - bus, Metrorail, VRE to – to the Mark Center from various points in the region such as from Quantico, Woodbridge, Lorton, Fairfax City, Centreville, Chantilly, Dulles, Leesburg, Bethesda, Rockville, Silver Spring, DC, Greenbelt, Largo, Suitland, Annapolis, Waldorf, and etc...

The employee Transportation Coordinator will be responsible for personalized commute assistance which can include aiding employees in determining transit options and transit commute times from their point of origin.

These transit commute time details, however, will not be provided in the TMP.

Shuttle Routes

28. The section on proposed shuttle routes is preliminary. While City staff understands the shuttle bus plan will need to be revised periodically, a final draft plan should have been included in the TMP.

The shuttle plan details were not included in the draft TMP as they were not final at that time.

The plan will be finalized before the TMP is finalized. Therefore the details of the shuttle plan will be included in the final version of the TMP. The details that will be included are:

- System Service Capacity
- Number of Buses
- Headways
- Routes and Shuttle Destinations (including a Franconia/Springfield Route)
- Estimated Passengers

29. Arranging a meeting with private companies to assess provision of transit connections from areas to the south (page 36) is not sufficient. Instead, the Army should initially provide shuttle service to Lorton/Quantico, Woodbridge and Fredericksburg. Successful service to these locations will help entice the private operators to provide the transit service from these locations.

The TMP relies on existing mass transit from the South including VRE, and bus service that typically runs to the Pentagon, along with alternative modes such as carpool, vanpool, and slugging to achieve the projected the non-SOV mode split.

The DoD shuttle system described in Section 3.5.2 will provide the final leg of the trip for rail transit riders.

WHS will continue to work with private transit providers to establish more direct service to Mark Center. It is important to note that the one service currently operating to Mark Center does so via the Pentagon. Within six months of the relocation, WHS will administer results of their surveys to private companies in order to engage them in onboard surveys to determine if there is a high enough demand to provide direct transit service before relocation (see Section 3.3.2)

30. The shuttle bus plan does not include service to Springfield Metro or Van Dorn Metro. Frequent shuttle service should be provided to these two Metro stations.

There will be service to Franconia-Springfield and this will be noted in the final TMP. As the result of previous discussion with the City, Van Dorn is not being considered as a shuttle destination. As discussed elsewhere, the existing frequency of the Van Dorn Metro Station DASH routes are adequate for the projected demand.

31. Include trip times for shuttle runs via various routes.

The shuttle schedules are not finalized at this time. Once the schedules are finalized, they will be made available to City staff.

Carpool

32. Explain in more detail how the number for carpool (2.3 passengers per vehicle) is obtained and how this number ties in to the HOV-3 required on I-395.

The 2.3 passengers per vehicle is a statistic that was obtained from a number of WMATA studies. While HOV does require a 3-person minimum in carpools, HOV also permits solo drivers in hybrids as well as motorcycles, (with I-66 requiring a 2-person minimum) which drops the average from 3 to 2.3 ppv. A citation in text will be made in the final TMP to explain the source of the number and how it was developed.

Vanpool

33. Page 111, short distance vanpooling will be very difficult to do/organized and is not cost effective to those that use it. What is considered "short distance?"

The Team has engaged in a number of discussions with vanpool service providers and employees who believe that short distance vanpooling could be viable due to the parking restrictions at BRAC-133 and the clustering of zip codes. For employees who live within 10 miles of the site, but who live too far from transit (i.e., zip code 22212), it may be viable to consider using a vanpool as a type of "personalized self-driven shuttle service", providing the only other door-to-door solution aside from carpooling. While carpooling can be simpler for communities with lower densities, many employees live in clusters within the same zip code, making vanpool more efficient than usual.

34. Under vanpooling, the TMP mentions that there should be outreach done to get employees that live in Maryland to use vanpools; however, the TMP fails to mention park and ride facilities in Maryland. In most cases, vanpool pickups are at park and ride facilities. This TMP should include both NOVA and Maryland park and ride facilities and their respective capacities.

The TMP discusses park and rides from around the region in Section 3.3.2 and in Appendix D, and both sections make mention of park and rides in Maryland. Utilization information for park and rides was not available for all areas.

The City of Alexandria has agreed to coordinate with other agencies to determine if additional Maryland park and ride utilization information is available. If the information is available, the City will provide this data for inclusion in the final TMP.

Bicycling

35. The TMP discusses a bike station on page 118, which is an interesting idea. Has this been explored with the City?

This is a long term solution that will not be discussed with the City until it is deemed viable, as per the stipulations detailed in Section 5.9.4. If there is a dramatic increase in mode share and a business case for a bike station, the idea will be examined at that time.

36. In Section 5.9.4, “Recommended Improvements”, WHS should include consideration of whether TMP funds may be directed to transportation demand management measures including participation in regional bicycle sharing programs.

WHS will closely monitor the use of bicycles as one of its transportation demand management strategies and if the demand demonstrates a business case for participation in regional bike sharing programs, it will examine whether appropriated funds can be legally used for this purpose.

37. Procedures, rules and regulations for bike locker usage should be developed.

Bike racks, not lockers, will be provided for employees, as stated in Section 5.9.2. The reference to lockers in the TMP refers to shower and gym lockers for personal possessions, which will be open for use by cyclists.

The Transportation Coordinator(s) will develop terms of use for all transportation-related facilities, including lockers, to be included under “Codes of Conduct” in the Orientation Handbook described in Section 5.3.2.

38. The Transportation Coordinator should also act as biking coordinator to help serve as an advocate and point of contact for the biking community.

The TMP currently states that the Transportation Coordinator(s) will manage the bicycle and walk program as well as be the point of contact for bicycle advocacy and community groups (see Section 5.9.3).

39. A thorough biking safety examination of bike ways in and out of the site and around the garage should be conducted with the Biking and Pedestrian Coordinator and the TDM Coordinator to help avoid future issues.

This is a separate exercise outside of the TMP that will be conducted with the WHS Transportation Coordinator(s).

The TMP will not include details or language on the safety examination.

40. Does the site plan to host its own Bike to Work Day event separate from the Council of Governments regional bike to work day event?

The Bike to Work Day event will be the regional event sponsored by MWCOC. Section 5.9.3 discusses WHS’s planned involvement in the regional event.

41. Periodic Confident Cycling Classes that are coordinated by the Washington Area Bicycle Association should be conducted on site for prospective bike commuters.

The TMP states that bicycle training and safety classes will be conducted on-site for bicycle commuters (Section 5.9.3). The exact classes will be determined by WHS at a later date and could very well include WABA classes.

42. Each of the proposed “Bicycle Safe Routes” in Appendix E contains text encouraging potential bicycle commuters to travel on “sidewalks” or “bicycle-designated sidewalks.” In Alexandria, city code Sec. 10-7-4 says that “no bicycle shall be operated on any sidewalk in city, except such sidewalks or portions thereof which city council shall by resolution designate as bicycle routes.” For this reason, bicyclists should not be directed to ride on sidewalks in the City. In Virginia, a bicycle is considered a vehicle when ridden on roads and streets and Sec. 46.2-904 allows localities to prohibit bicycles from using sidewalks, although this must be done with conspicuously posted signs. The City completed a Bicycle Level of Service analysis for the existing on-street bikeway network which

grades roadways (A-F) for bicycle use. A map of current Bicycle Level of Service in Alexandria is online here >>

http://alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/localmotion/info/gettingaround/Fig15Bicycle_Level_Of_Service.pdf

Adjustments will be made to remove any instances of the word “safe” and to remove language referring to the use of sidewalks by bicycles.

Pedestrian

43. In Section 3.2.4 “Pedestrian Access Facilities” , any references to off-site improvements that are not currently proposed for improvement as part of the site planning should be coordinated with proposed pedestrian improvements in the City’s 2008 Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Plan >>
<http://alexandriava.gov/localmotion/info/default.aspx?id=11418>

Any off-site improvements included in this diagram are those that have already been approved by the City. The sidewalk plans for the offsite road improvements (along Seminary, Beauregard, and Mark Center Drive) were part of an offsite road package submitted to the City, and therefore were reviewed extensively by City staff prior to City signoff of the plans. On-site sidewalks (the walks around the north parking garage and round-a-bout), were not subject to formal City review; however, the entire site, landscape, and pedestrian circulation plan was reviewed with City Planning staff as part of BRAC 133 design coordination.

Telecommuting

44. The Draft TMP includes almost no discussion about telecommuting. More thorough treatment is needed.

Section 5.8.3 of the TMP presents a 1-page discussion on telecommuting at BRAC-133.

The City has indicated they will provide additional steps for ensuring telecommute goals that will be provided to the BRAC 133 Team for inclusion in the TMP. USACE/WHS will review these procedures for compliance with DoD protocol and determine which steps (if any) are applicable and can be included in the final TMP.

45. For mid day trips, include something on video conference meetings via a conference room, laptop, notebook, smartphone, etc. to reduce the number of trips needed during the mid day (if feasible).

Adjustments will be made to the final TMP to accommodate this language.

Slugging

46. Need more specifics regarding how slugging will occur. How will they deal with no HOV off ramp at Seminary and I-395?

Slugging is an informal commute mode and is therefore difficult to predict. How slugging is expected to occur is discussed in Section 2.3 under “Slug” and in Section 3.4.

47. The 3% for slug in the anticipated mode split is high for several reasons: there is only 140’ of dedicated space for slugs; the nearest HOV entrance going southbound is 2.5 miles away, and the nearest HOV exit going northbound is at Franconia Springfield and the Pentagon; individuals in Fairfax, Burke, West Springfield, Springfield areas working at BRAC 133 using I-495 to access I-395

will have little incentive to slug as they will not be able to take advantage of the HOV unless they plan to drive to the Pentagon and turn around. Is it safe to assume that traffic going southbound on I-395 in the AM peak will increase as more people will be traveling to places such as BRAC 133, Fort Belvoir, the EPG, Springfield, etc. Also, one must have a permit to park in order to slug from BRAC 133.

See response to comment #1 above.

48. On page 15, the TMP mentions The Native Slugs of Northern Virginia study shows that 65 percent of sluggers travel to work anywhere from 10 minutes to greater than 30 minutes beyond the slugging drop-off point. Once dropped off, sluggers then either walk, bike, or take transit to get to their employment destination. Is this a correct assumption or is the assumption that people that are taking slugs will then drive 10 to 30 minutes more to their place of employment? Also within that particular study, the change of employment location was one of the main reasons why people decided to make a change to another mode other than slugging. Was this factored into the 3% for slug?

It has been verified that the above assumption is correct. As discussed on page 26 of that report, 65% of sluggers do travel an additional 10-30+ minutes from their slugging drop off point, be it via rail or bus, or even driving as 1/3 of the respondents to that survey represented drivers.

Yes, this study found that change of employment location was a reason for changing to a different mode, but this was a hypothetical question and likely most respondents answered the question with the thinking that a change in work location could involve a variety of complex changes such as taking a job that was not in the region, that was too far from the slugging drop off point, or that does not have transit connections. This will not be the case at BRAC 133 as shuttle service will be available to a major slugging drop off point, the Pentagon.

49. Employees with parking permits that drive slugs to the Pentagon or other drop off points would still require a parking permit at the Mark Center and would still impact the local roads and community. These should be included as part of the percentage of SOV trips, as they have the same impact as SOVs.

Slug trips are included in the traffic analysis of total trips to the site, but the slug drivers were not considered as part of the SOV commuters since slugging is a recognized alternate commute mode.

50. Slugs that arrive at the Pentagon and then take the DoD shuttle should be included in the transit percentages, not in the slug percentages.

Slugs who ride to the Pentagon and then take the DoD shuttle should be reflected in both the slug numbers and in the shuttle numbers. The final version of the TMP will be updated to reflect the final shuttle plan and will include these slugs who ride the shuttle. To be conservative it will be assumed that no slugs get a ride directly to Mark Center so all have to ride the DoD shuttle.

51. If employees are able to arrive by slugging, the vehicle they arrive in for drop-off (if not a BRAC permitted vehicle) eliminates the need for parking, but still impacts the local road system and community.

See response to comment #4 above.

52. The location of the dedicated slug lanes / off peak taxi stand adjacent to the transit center / parking garage may cause issues with traffic leaving the garage, those making right hand turns onto Mark Center Drive, and with buses making right turns to access the transit center.

Usage of the slug area is difficult to predict at this time and will likely change over time. WHS will observe operations over time in and around the Transportation Center and the slug area and they may choose in the future to alter shuttle routes or move the slug area to a different location.

Taxis

53. Under Slug Lines & Taxis, nothing is mentioned about taxis.

An adjustment will be made to correct this in the TMP.

54. The TMP needs to expand on the plan to integrate taxi service at the facility.

Section 5.7 describes the plan to integrate taxi service during the off-peak. An adjustment will be made to describe this earlier in the final TMP.

TDM Plan

55. The branding of the WHS TMP should be strongly linked and subsidiary to Local Motion.

As discussed in the TMP, the Transportation Coordinator(s) will liaise with the City of Alexandria, VA's Employer Services Outreach Specialist in order to become familiar with the City's "Local Motion" program and its associated employer commuter services, both prior to the building opening and quarterly thereafter to maintain coordination with the City and receive updated information on City and community transportation programs (see Section 5.2.2). The program will be branded as the WHS Transportation Management Program and will therefore not be linked as a subsidiary of the Local Motion Program.

56. All employees should be enrolled in the WHS TMP.

The intent is to have all BRAC-133 employees enrolled in the program.

57. The employee orientation materials and handbook should include information on Local Motion and bicycle maps.

As described in Section 5.2.1, the WHS Transportation Management Program Office will house various materials including information on transportation programs in the region and bicycle maps.

58. There appears to be no mention of ongoing and/or regularly distributed forms or marketing and promotion, i.e. a webpage or website, newsletter, etc.

Every subsection within Section 5 of the TMP includes mention of ongoing marketing and web updates.

59. A contractor should be hired to assist with marketing, outreach, and promotional events

This is part of the responsibilities of the Transportation Coordinator (see Section 5.2.2).

60. The Site should reach out to the Patent and Trademark Office in Alexandria and the EPA buildings located in Arlington Potomac Yard to glean information on TMP/TDM best practices, successes, and failures.

In developing the TMP the team has gleaned information from multiple City and other agency TMPs. WHS will liaise with other agency Transportation Coordinators moving forward.

61. Relationships should be created and maintained with the following organizations:

- a. VPSI (area's largest vanpool provider for federal agencies),
- b. Commuter Connections
- c. the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VA's TDM agency),
- d. Bike/Walk Alexandria,
- e. WABA,
- f. www.slug-lines.com,
- g. Telework!VA
- h. Association for Commuter Transportation

WHS has existing and ongoing relationships with most of the organizations listed above. The Transportation Coordinator(s) will have the responsibility for liaising with any and all regional transportation resources as necessary to manage a successful program.

62. There should be some sort of cash-out option for those that use alternative modes of transportation other than transit, including a provision for a mix and match program option for those that use multiple types of alternate modes.

The only Federal benefit for alternative modes of travel is the Federal transit subsidy. It's believed that restrictions on its use are well-defined and understood.

Transportation Coordinator

63. Local Motion is the City's TDM Program, so it should be explicitly stated that a close relationship between the Transportation Coordinator and the program will be essential.

Section 5.2.2 of the TMP currently states that the Transportation Coordinator will liaise with the City's Local Motion Program.

64. The Transportation Coordinator (TC) should be required to become a member of the Association for Commuter Transportation (ACT). ACT is the TDM industry's largest trade association and it supports individual mobility management professionals and organizational members in their efforts to reduce traffic congestion, conserve energy and improve air quality.

WHS will consider requiring their Transportation Coordinator to join ACT.

65. The TC should be required to attend any employee orientations that the tenants have to discuss the all TDM programs and services and transportation alternatives to driving alone.

The TMP currently states that the Transportation Coordinator(s) will enroll new employees into the WHS Transportation Management Program and assist them through educational orientation materials in making a decision on the most feasible commute for them (see Section 5.2.2).

The TMP also states throughout Section 5 that the Transportation Coordinator is in charge of organizing all employee orientations and that these orientations will be run specifically to discuss transportation options and TDM programs.

66. The TC should be required to regularly attend the regional Commuter Connection and Council of City Government planning meetings and trainings.

WHS will continue to attend and actively participate in regional transportation forums.

This language will be included in the final TMP.

Commuter Store

67. The site needs to have a staffed permanent transportation center/transit store.

Currently there is no planned space for a permanent transit store at the Transportation Center although there will be a mobile commuter store present at the facility twice a week (and more often if possible during the first several months of the building being open). The provision of a transit store is a long-term strategy that will be implemented if there is a rise in transit use and/or use of the Transportation Center whereby expansion will be necessary, as stated in Section 5.5.4.

68. It will be very difficult to secure the Mobile Commuter Store twice a month let alone twice a week due to both price and capacity. Further definitive discussions with the Mobile Commuter Store need to occur and the inclusion of the Mobile Commuter Store in the TMP should be adjusted accordingly.

WHS has been and will continue having discussions regarding this topic. The intent is to have the Mobile Commuter Store present at Mark Center twice a week.

Transit Subsidy

69. Are Metro Fare Cards in the denominations of \$1, \$5, \$10, and \$30 available as indicated in 5.5.1(ii)a? The WMATA site seems to only list \$10 and \$20.

Yes, Metro fare cards are in denominations of \$1, \$5, \$10, and \$30 as indicated in the TMP.

70. With the SmartBenefits program and the IRS mandate that begins on 1/1/2010, will Metro farecards still be distributed? Does DoD need to comply with the IRS mandate for SmartBenefits / the federal transit subsidy program? If so, the language on the distribution of farecards should be changed.

Additional information including appropriate regulatory references are needed to respond. DoD programs comply with appropriate laws.

Ridematching

71. In response to purchasing ridematching software, Commuter Connections, a regional network of transportation organizations coordinated by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, has a very comprehensive ridematching database that can be accessed online and used by BRAC-133 commuters.

The Team agrees and is aware of this option-however, due to the nature of work and to protect the identity and privacy of employees, an internal ridematching software is still preferred and will be made available in addition to regional ridematching programs. Part of the Transportation Coordinator(s)' responsibilities is to make all regional and local ridematching programs known to employees, as stated in Section 5.6.1, item iii; however, it is up to the employee to decide which ridematching database to utilize.

Carsharing

72. The City's carshare incentive program, Carshare Alexandria program needs to be mentioned here to help incentivize employees to use the lone Zipcar in the immediate area.

An adjustment will be made to the final TMP to include this incentive.

73. Hertz Connect, a new Carsharing company in the area should be contacted about the possibility of adding a car on site.

Section 5.7.1 of the TMP states that there will be a demand analysis done for obtaining additional car-sharing vehicles. The vendor would be determined at that time.

Parking

74. Information on how many ADA parking spaces will be provided in each garage should be provided.

All 48 employee ADA parking spaces will be located in the South Garage in order to be located within shortest walking distance to building entry.

Three additional visitor parking spaces will be ADA spaces in the North Garage.

Adjustment will be made to the TMP to indicate the location of the spaces

75. Information on how many carpool and vanpool parking spaces will be provided in the north parking garage should be provided.

The TMP states that all 320 carpool and vanpool parking spaces will be provided in the North Garage (see Section 5.4.2).

76. Carpool and Vanpool parking spaces should be provided in their South parking garage.

With the primary security checkpoint being located in the South Garage, it is more favorable for carpools and vanpools that are carrying multiple employees to save time by parking in the North Garage where security checkpoint queuing can be avoided, as stated in Section 5.4.2. It should also be noted that the North Parking Garage meets LEED Gold requirements for proximity to building entrances.

77. What is the definition of “preferential” when referring to parking for car and vanpools?

“Preferential Parking” is a TDM term synonymous to “priority parking”. “Preferential Parking” indicates spaces that give specific parking privileges to carpool/vanpool permit holders (i.e., guaranteed parking space, parking close to the entrance of the worksite, parking near the “fastest way in and out”, etc.).

78. It should be noted that spots for electric cars at the EPA Arlington/Potomac Yard building have not been utilized once since the building was constructed 4 years ago.

Noted.

79. Signatures of the primary driver’s supervisor should be required for carpool and vanpool priority parking applications.

PFPA PMB is the supervisory organization that manages and distributes carpool/vanpool spaces (as stated in Section 5.4.2). Upon PFPA PMB review of the application, PFPA PMB will authorize priority parking applications.

80. The discussion/comparison of flex-time parking between the 2003 Mark Center TMP and the BRAC-133 TMP is confusing and should be further explained. For example, explain why “the BRAC 133 TMP is not able to guarantee flex-time parking for employees” and the impact of that practice on the parking.

Currently over 40% of employees work a flexible work schedule and the TMP has goals to increase this participation rate by an additional 25%, which would mean that 65% of employees would be guaranteed a

parking space. Guaranteeing parking for flex-time employees may result in an increase in SOV mode of travel.

- Additionally, this TMP strategy only works if there is not a one-to-one permit process in place, as the flex-time parking in the 2003 TMP was only temporary and was lifted after 10am. Not having a one-to-one permit process would result in spillover parking.
- Language will be included in the final TMP to explain this.

81. Address how BRAC-133 is going to address overflow parking in public and private areas. The TMP should make provisions for providing gates for lots, etc when an overflow parking problem occurs due to BRAC employee parking.

The BRAC 133 TMP and its managing entities will not be responsible for managing overflow parking outside of BRAC 133 property and garages. As stated in Section 5.4.3, it will be the responsibility of neighboring properties to mitigate overflow. This section of the TMP notes strategies that are currently in place or that are in the works, and suggests strategies that neighboring properties can implement in order to mitigate the effects of spillover parking.

82. The TDM plan calls for 48 disabled parking spaces in the parking facilities. What is the plan if more than 48 employees qualify for a disabled spot? Will the disabled employee be required to have a state-issued disabled license plate or placard?

48 spaces were provided per ADA requirements. As is the legal requirement for all disabled parking spaces, a disabled license plate and/or placard must be displayed to parking in a disabled parking space.

In the event more than 48 employees require reasonable accommodation in the form of a disabled parking space, WHS will comply with the law and make adjustments to the parking plan as required.

83. Will the government vehicle parking include on-site vehicles as well as employees with take-home government vehicles? What is the number of take-home government vehicles among the combined tenant organizations?

It is not known at this time how many government vehicles will be take-home vehicles, but it is not expected to be significant.

84. Section 3.6.2 states that the many park and ride lots have excess capacity. Which of the park and ride lots are underutilized? How will this information be distributed to the commuting population?

Appendix D indicates capacity and utilization for a number of Northern Virginia park and ride lots. Capacity and utilization information was not available for all park and ride lots. This information will be distributed in the Orientation Handbook described in Section 5.3.2

85. A reference is made to free parking. The Army needs to provide the proper legislation that negates Circular No. A-118, dated August 13, 1979, in which the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) announced the establishment of a Government-wide policy dealing with Federal parking facilities. According to OMB, a basis for charging for the use of parking facilities needed to be established which was equitable among employees and consistent with related policies regarding air quality, energy conservation and reduced traffic congestion.

As a matter of policy, DoD will not be charging employees for parking and has discussed this with the City of Alexandria. The limited parking availability at BRAC-133 along with the extensive TDM program will provide significant incentive for employees to use non-SOV modes of travel to the site.

86. Section 4.5.2 mitigation effort number 8 states that some government vehicles may be made available for mid-day travel to off-site meetings. This language should be strengthened to say government vehicles will be provided, so that SOV trips due to midday off-sites will be discouraged.

Not all government vehicles will be available for employee travel use so the suggested change is not valid. It should be noted that DoD is planning on shuttle service throughout the work day for official travel.

87. Criteria for issuance of a parking permit should be established and consistent throughout tenant organizations.

Criteria for issuance of a parking permit will be up to the operating procedures and parking policies of each individual tenant organization. PFPA will not control these policies and procedures.

Traffic Impact Analysis

88. The findings and recommendations included in the traffic analysis section are not reliable as the traffic micro-simulation models were not properly calibrated.

Document is being revised to include model verification details that replicate existing AM and PM peak field conditions. The volume throughputs and representative queue data that were used to verify the existing AM and PM peak hour models will be provided.

The document will also be edited to clarify that these existing models were used in the development of the 2011 models and CORSIM default value assumptions.

The calibration data will be appended to the final TMP.

89. What do the recommendations from the TIA add to a TMP? Is the analysis and suggestion of recommendations appropriate for this type of document?

Recommendations based on the TIA were not required; however, this section was added to accommodate all feasible recommendations made by the BRAC Advisory Group. In this section the team also took the liberty of adding additional recommendations based on the results of the analysis which should inform ongoing analysis of future transportation improvements under consideration.

The title of this section (Section 4.4.9 Recommended Solutions) will be adjusted to have softer language and will remove the term recommendations and will take on a title such as "Suggestions that require further consideration/study". Emphatic language will be added indicating that these solutions require additional analysis and resources.

Adjustments will be made to the final TMP to clarify this.

90. The CORSIM study area used for the analysis was very limited. The limitations in the study area reduce the validity of the transportation analysis.

The traffic study included as part of the TMP is a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed development and therefore includes the roadway network only within the proposed development and in the surrounding area that is immediately affected by the development within the City of Alexandria. This study area is also consistent with other traffic reports developed for the Mark Center site.

This TIA study is not similar in nature to VDOT Interchange Justification Report (IJR) which focuses on the I-395 corridor and the adjacent interchanges within the region, and hence should not be compared to the BRAC 133 TMP. The IJR was developed for FHWA to justify the improvements to the interchanges on I-395. Therefore, the study area used is appropriate for the type of traffic analysis that was performed for the BRAC 133 site. It conforms to methodologies recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and industry standards.

The results of the traffic impact analysis are valid for the key internal roadway intersections.

91. Other On-Going Study Improvements (page 92): VDOT is also doing a detailed operational assessment of short-term improvements.

Adjustment will be made to the final TMP to accommodate this language.

92. Page 22 refers to the HOV lanes in I-395 serving Seminary Road. Clarification is needed on whether there an exit or entrance from northbound or southbound HOV lanes, and if not, where the closest access would be for entry to or exit from the HOV lanes.

Adjustment will be made to the final TMP to accommodate this language.

93. Section 3.2.1 refers to providing a “concrete barrier obstruction”. This needs to be replaced with “physical barrier.”

Adjustment will be made to the final TMP to accommodate this language.

94. The study conclusion in Section 4.1.9 discusses the effect of turn lane improvements on the PM peak hour, but did not address the AM peak hour.

Adjustment will be made to the final TMP to accommodate this language.

95. Section 4.4.8 needs to specify locations where the short distance merges are projected to cause traffic operational problems as referenced under “Other Concerns”.

Adjustment will be made to the final TMP to accommodate this language.

96. The recommended roadway improvement number 4 in Section 4.4.9, “Provide a direct HOV access ramp from I-395 south to Seminary Road” is already in existence.

DoD is aware that this recommendation for constructing a direct HOV access ramp is being examined by VDOT and the City of Alexandria.

An adjustment will be made to the final the TMP that will clarify that this is an existing recommendation that is currently being examined; however, it is an improvement that needs to be not just studied, but implemented.

97. Include analysis for Recommended Intersection Improvement No. 1 in section 4.4.9.

A figure representing the proposed improvement has been appended to the report. This is a suggested recommendation with spot analysis only. Additional corridor wide analysis is required to validate this solution.

Language will also be adjusted to indicate that this improvement is not a recommendation but a solution for further consideration.

98. The Recommended Traffic Control Improvements No.1 in section 4.4.9 has been completed.

Adjustment will be made to the final TMP to accommodate this language.

99. Signage on private streets as suggested in Recommended Internal Circulation Improvements in section 4.4.9 should be coordinated with property owners.

Proposed signage is only along Seminary Road at I-395 ramp traffic merge and diverge locations and internally within the Mark Center site. No signage has been proposed along private streets. Adjustment will be made.

100. Section 4.5.1 should include in its list of improvements being made by the Army the increase in number of buses on King Street to King Street Station.

The City of Alexandria has instructed USACE/WHS not to respond this comment.

Reporting

101. In order that the City and the DOD can continue to be partners in adjusting the TMP to minimize the impact of BRAC-133 on adjoining neighborhoods, a regular method of reporting information to the City, which the DOD is promising to collect, should be established in the TMP document.

As stated in Section 6.2, copies of evaluation reports will be provided to the City as they are available.

Language on reporting frequency will be added to the final TMP.

102. The State of the Commute Report needs to be shared with the City of Alexandria. The TMP should state such within the document.

The “State of the Commute Report” is the same as the Evaluation Report described in Section 6.2 whereby the City does receive a copy of the report. Adjustment will be made to the TMP to clarify this discrepancy.

103. On page 120, indicate that an Evaluation Report will be submitted to the City of Alexandria every six months.

The City will be provided an evaluation report twice in the first year, and annually thereafter.

An adjustment will be made to the final TMP to clarify this.

104. The TMP should address what steps will be taken if goals are not met. The TMP should also address what the reserve plan is if the goals are not met.

We are confident in the abilities of WHS to meet the goals of the TMP given that the DoD shuttle system will provide such extensive service with capacity for 40% of the building population, combined with the fact that the building will have such limited parking available, and finally given that WHS will be implementing a variety of other comprehensive TDM strategies. WHS will be evaluating achievement of goals over time (and formally with each Evaluation Report), and will be setting new goals over time based on findings.

The final TMP will include language that will demonstrate examples of how goals will be assessed and rectified if not met, (i.e., if transit ridership goals are not met, WHS will reexamine the DoD shuttle plan and make changes to increase ridership, etc.)

Funding

105. Provide information on funding for implementation of TDM strategies. For example, amount available for implementation, annual monies available for operations, etc.

The TMP will include language that DoD is programming for funding to fully support TDM strategies, including the robust shuttle system described therein.